

THE CHURCHMAN

APRIL -

JUNE 1960

Contents

Vol. LXXIV. No. 2

New Series

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	67
THE NEW BAPTISMAL SERVICES : A CRITICISM	
The Rev. Donald W. B. Robinson, M.A.	71
CONFIRMATION IN THE CHURCH TODAY	
The Editor	84
THE BIBLE AND ANGLICAN PIETY	
The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D.	90
EXPOSITORY PREACHING : CHARLES SIMEON AND OURSELVES	
The Rev. James I. Packer, M.A., D.Phil.	94
SOME THEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN RELATION TO RELIGIOUS CONVERSION	
The Rev. Owen Brandon, M.A.	101
THE DIVINE AND HUMAN ELEMENTS IN CONVERSION	
The Rev. Maurice A. P. Wood, D.S.C., M.A.	110
BOOK REVIEWS	
Edward Schweizer : <i>Lordship and Discipleship</i>	119
M. F. Wiles : <i>The Spiritual Gospel</i>	120
R. P. C. Hanson : <i>God : Creator, Saviour, Spirit</i>	121
Stephen Neill : <i>Christian Holiness</i>	122
Berthold Altaner : <i>Patrology</i>	123
Jacques Maritain : <i>The Degrees of Knowledge</i>	123
C. S. Lewis : <i>The Four Loves</i>	124
Marcus L. Loane : <i>Archbishop Mowll</i>	125
R. B. Martin : <i>The Dust of Combat</i>	126
G. W. Bromiley : <i>Daniel Henry Charles Bartlett</i>	127
Gabriel Langfeldt : <i>Albert Schweitzer</i>	128
Lesslie Newbigin : <i>The Reunion of the Church</i>	129
Ronald S. Wallace : <i>Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life</i>	130
Pierre Maury : <i>Predestination and Other Papers</i>	131
Brevard S. Childs : <i>Myth and Reality in the Old Testament</i>	132
Paul Hessert : <i>Introduction to Christianity</i>	133
Ed. Kenneth M. Carey : <i>The Historic Episcopate in the Fulness of the Church</i>	134
Williston Walker : <i>A History of the Christian Church</i>	134
Octavius Winslow : <i>Personal Declension and Revival of Religion in the Soul</i>	135
John Owen : <i>The Death of Death in the Death of Christ</i>	135
Joseph Alleine : <i>An Alarm to the Unconverted</i>	136
George Eldon Ladd : <i>The Gospel of the Kingdom</i>	137
E. M. Blaiklock : <i>Faith is the Victory</i>	138
F. F. Bruce : <i>The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel</i>	138
J. A. Motyer : <i>The Revelation of the Divine Name</i>	139
J. G. S. S. Thomson : <i>The Word of the Lord in Jeremiah</i>	139
A. Skevington Wood : <i>Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation</i>	139
G. A. F. Knight : <i>Hosea</i>	139
A. R. C. Leaney : <i>The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon</i>	140
H. E. Huntley : <i>The Faith of a Physicist</i>	140
E. R. Hardy : <i>Faithful Witnesses</i>	141
Gerhard von Rad : <i>Moses</i>	141
James Martin : <i>Letters of Caiaphas to Annas</i>	141
John Symonds : <i>Madame Blavatsky</i>	142
Smiley Blanton : <i>Now or Never</i>	143
Charles L. Allen : <i>All Things are Possible through Prayer</i>	143
Martin Descalzo : <i>God's Frontier</i>	143
Mary Bosanquet : <i>Mother of the Magnificent</i>	144
S. Pienaar and Anthony Sampson : <i>South Africa</i>	144

THE CHURCHMAN

Editor :

THE REV. PHILIP E. HUGHES, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.

The Editor welcomes manuscripts, which should be typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. He cannot guarantee their return unless stamps are enclosed.

Books for review, manuscripts, and editorial correspondence should be sent to the Editor, at

7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4

Subscriptions and all business correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers.

Price : Two Shillings and Sixpence

Annual Subscription : Ten Shillings per annum, post free.

In the U.S.A., annual subscription one dollar, payable to
The Seminary Bookstore, Virginia Theological Seminary,
Alexandria, Va., U.S.A.

Publishers :

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

Writers in this Issue

OWEN BRANDON is Chaplain and Tutor at the London College of Divinity.

JAMES PACKER is Senior Tutor at Tyndale Hall, Bristol.

DONALD ROBINSON is Vice-Principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia.

RONALD WILLIAMS is Bishop of Leicester and was formerly Principal of St. John's College, Durham.

MAURICE WOOD is Vicar and Rural Dean of Islington, London, N.1, and a member of the Church Assembly Committee on Evangelism.

Editorial

THE question is being asked today whether the Roman Catholic Church, despite its significant motto *Semper Eadem*, is not in fact undergoing changes of a more or less radical nature. This question should be of particular moment for all seriously thinking Protestants. We can only welcome and thank God for signs that in some parts the Holy Scriptures are being permitted to circulate with greater freedom among the ordinary people (see, for example, the Bishop of Leicester's observation in his article in this issue), and that there is an upsurge of interest in biblical theology and exegesis in scholarly circles; for the knowledge of the Word of God gives light and freedom and is, indeed, the fundamental principle of the genuine reformation of the Church in every generation. It is through a turning and returning to the Word of God and the acceptance of the Gospel of God's free grace which it proclaims that hopes for the transforming of the Church of Rome alone can have any prospect of fulfilment. In this respect, Evangelical Christians have every right to be prayerfully optimistic, realizing that the Word of God is still living and powerful, and that the great liberation experienced in the Reformation of four hundred years ago was due to the rediscovery, under God, of that Word.

There have certainly been some quite unusual developments within the Roman Catholic Church, particularly in cisalpine countries, during recent times. The so-called "New Theology", for instance, manifest in the main in France, represents a reaction against the barrenness of the official medieval Thomistic-Aristotelian synthesis in favour of a more contemporary and, in so far as it is related to biblical reality, more fruitful approach to the theological task which confronts the Church. There can be little doubt that this movement has received an impulse from the renewed vigour of Protestant studies in biblical theology.

Another significant phenomenon has been the growth of the *Una Sancta* movement, chiefly on German soil, where the menace of a common danger, namely, the fierce anti-Christian tyranny of Nazism, had the effect of throwing Roman Catholics and Protestants together. They found that they were able to talk to each other and to co-operate in ways which had hitherto seemed impossible, and even at times to worship together. There has been a new spirit of willingness on the part of many Roman Catholics to give sympathetic consideration to the principles of Protestantism. Indeed, the *Una Sancta* movement has been indicative of a desire for religion that is evangelical and that allows scope for the exercise of private judgment. With it may be coupled the appearance in certain quarters of a liturgical movement directed towards making the worship of the Roman Church both more intelligible and more congregational. It is surely something worth remarking when the liturgy of the Mass is conducted in the vernacular instead of in Latin, when the celebrant adopts the westward position, facing the people, when a table is substituted for the altar, and when the sacrament is celebrated in the evening.

Another symptom of dissatisfaction with things as they are has been

the organization of the priest-worker movement in France, the object of which has been to reach the industrial masses whose outlook has become circumscribed by the unspiritual this-worldly values of secularism and materialism. Priests, specially trained, have endeavoured to establish contact with the working classes by living in their midst as they live and by working at their side in the factories as fellow-artisans.

These and other developments are undeniably significant. They have stimulated hopes regarding the future of the Roman Catholic Church. They have presented opportunities for productive contacts and discussions. They have indicated that there are individuals and groups who are anxious to open a door for communication with those who do not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. It is right that we should take these things into account and, as we may have opportunity, seek to improve them to the glory of God. But we must, none the less, beware lest we fall facilely into the error of thinking that the Roman Catholic Church as such has in any way officially altered its position and relaxed its claims to exclusiveness. That Church is still a monstrous authoritarian machine, relentless in its purpose, intolerant of change, insensitive to the claims of individuals and minorities.

The dogma of papal infallibility, promulgated at the momentous Vatican Council of 1870, has had the effect of entrenching its inherent dictatorship more firmly and inexorably than ever. Absolute and unquestioning submission to the papal voice, whether uttered directly from the Vatican or mediately through the ecclesiastical hierarchy, is if anything more binding than hitherto. The authoritarian inerrability of its "teaching office", which is fundamental to its system, means that the Roman Catholic Church as such cannot entertain second thoughts about itself or be open to radical (or even moderate) reformation without ceasing to be itself.

Accordingly, it must not surprise us to learn that the priest-worker movement has by official edict been brought to a standstill, or that the "New Theology", the *Una Sancta*, and the liturgical movements have been confined by orders from above within the most unaccommodating of ecclesiastical straitjackets. Again, we must not be deceived by the gentler tones in which the Reformation of the sixteenth century has in recent years been described, as though it were due to a regrettable misunderstanding of the true nature and benevolence of papal Christianity, and as though the latter were no less concerned with the need for reform. In point of fact, these wooing tones are more subtle, and calculated to be more successful, than the intemperate vilification and invective which it was for so long customary to hurl against the Reformation and its leaders. Far more eloquent of the true character of Romanism is the inescapable fact, never to be overlooked, that the anathemas pronounced four hundred years ago by the Council of Trent against the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation have never been withdrawn, but continue in full force. Any genuine change of heart in the Church of Rome must be heralded by the retraction of these anathemas—otherwise the gulf between us remains unbridged.

Meanwhile, Rome's terms for the reunion of Christendom continue

unaltered: they are summed up in the word absorption. The only move that it will contemplate is a move made by Protestants back into the papal fold. But so long as Protestants remain Protestants they are heretics, religious untouchables, excluded from salvation, and not to be tolerated. The politics of the Roman Catholic Church must be understood against this background. When it holds the whip hand, as in Spain, its intolerance is ruthless. When it is in a minority, as in England, its intolerance is veiled under a cloak of benevolence, while its agents labour by means of propaganda to win our adults and by means of attractive schools to capture our children, always with the ultimate objective of being our whole nation once again into submission to the papal overlordship.

One of the most noticeable features of contemporary Romanism has been the quite extraordinary growth in modern times of the cult of the Virgin Mary. Evidence of this is afforded not only by the immense popularity of pilgrimages to places like Lourdes in France and Fatima in Portugal, but also, and even more significantly, by papal pronouncements which have decreed *ex cathedra*, that is, as absolutely binding on all the faithful, the dogmas of Mary's immaculate conception (1854) and bodily assumption (1950), and which have even gone so far as blasphemously to assign to her the dignity of hypostatic union with the Holy Trinity. The tenor of recent pronouncements coupled with the excesses of veneration that are encouraged provide, in fact, every reason for anticipating that in the foreseeable future the dogma of Mary's co-redeemership with Christ will be promulgated from the infallible papal throne. This startling trend—which, incidentally, is an extreme outworking of the characteristic synergism of Romish anthropology—is quite definitely incompatible with the central doctrines of the New Testament, and is therefore a movement which is *away from Christianity*. It is also beyond doubt a cause of misgiving to numbers of thoughtful men and women within the Roman Catholic Church (cf. the review of Berthold Altaner's *Patrology* in this issue).

Those who wish for a reliable and intelligent exposition of the contemporary situation in the Roman Catholic Church, based upon a thorough knowledge of the subject, are confidently advised to study Walther von Loewenich's book *Modern Catholicism* which has recently been published by Macmillan's (379 pp., 50s.). In Dr. von Loewenich, who is a member of the German Lutheran Church and Professor of Protestant Church History at Erlangen University, they will find a stimulating guide. His book contains a wealth of information, presented and discussed with admirable clarity. It is written in a spirit of charity throughout; yet in sum it builds up a massive indictment of the totalitarian ecclesiastical régime of present-day Roman Catholicism. The one weakness of this notable contribution to the controversy is the liberal relativism of Professor von Loewenich's own theological outlook. Fortunately, however, this weakness is not obtrusive but only occasional and incidental in what is essentially a historical-critical study. An excellent critique of contemporary Romanism from the point of view of Reformed theology will be found in the book *The Conflict with Rome* by G. C. Berkouwer (Philadelphia, 1958), who is Professor of Theology at the Free University of Amsterdam, and who also writes

with charity and understanding towards those with whom he disagrees.

Despite the apparent intractability of the Roman Catholic system, our attitude towards it should not be one of despair. Its adherents are our fellow human beings; their basic spiritual need is identical with our own. And let us not forget that our Reformers were all the Pope's men to begin with—most of them very obstinately so. The Word that prevailed so powerfully at the Reformation is no less able to prevail in lives and churches today. Protestants have drifted into a policy of non-interference where Roman Catholics are concerned. This is unevangelical. We should seek by personal contact and friendship to gain their attention and without harshness or pharisaical superciliousness—not as proselytizers, but as witnesses—to introduce them to the liberating truths of the Gospel, as “Little” Bilney once did on a famous occasion with Hugh Latimer.

* * * *

In this issue, Donald Robinson's vigorous critique of the proposed new baptismal services will, we hope, receive the serious attention it deserves. The article on Confirmation, which takes some account of the proposed new Confirmation services, is intended as an addendum to his article with a view to rounding out the picture relating to the Report of the Liturgical Commission. The Bishop of Leicester's article has the laudable purpose of inciting us to give effect to the call of the last Lambeth Conference for a deepening of the quality and an extension of the scope of both personal and corporate Bible study; and in this connection we should like to draw attention to his recently published booklet *Reading Through Hebrews*, a series of six readings with expository comments given by him in Leicester Cathedral during Lent of last year. James Packer's contribution represents the substance of the paper he read at this year's Islington Conference. The articles by Owen Brandon and Maurice Wood are concerned with a subject which is of maximum and perennial importance for the Church of Christ, and certainly not least for Evangelicals. If the former asks the questions, the latter may be felt to provide some of the answers—though the two articles were in fact prepared quite independently. This is a theme to which we shall hope to give more space in the future.

* * * *

We regret that, owing to a printing error, the date given on the spine of our last issue was March, 1959, instead of **March, 1960**. Our readers are requested kindly to make the necessary correction on their copies.

P.E.H.

The New Baptismal Services : A Criticism

BY DONALD ROBINSON

"THE palmary criteria of a liturgy are whether it makes sense or not (i.e. whether it has logical coherence) and what kind of sense it makes when measured by the standards of the Bible." So wrote Canon Charles Smyth in 1947, and by such tests the services for Baptism and Confirmation submitted to the Archbishops by the Church of England Liturgical Commission, must finally be judged.

First, however, one may legitimately wonder whether the step of producing new services for the Church of England at this stage is a proper step. The draft services are not a revision of the 1662 services as was the case with the 1927-28 forms; they draw from 1662, but in structure and content, to say nothing of theology, they are fresh compilations. Why has this been done? Are our present forms, which have served us for four centuries, so defective that there is no remedy but to rewrite them completely? Only a strong conviction of the deficiency of our Prayer Book services can justify the radical step of departing from our traditional Anglican use.

Consider, in this connection, the opinion of the 1954 Anglican Congress at Minneapolis that, since the Prayer Book "is a principal bond of unity between the Anglican Churches . . . the degree of variation should not be such as to disrupt our unity". In view of this opinion it is strange that the Church of England should at once lead off with brand new baptismal liturgies. Two of the Commissioners are in fact unable to approve the new form for Infant Baptism and the introduction to the Confirmation service on the ground that they involve "too great a departure from the pattern in general use in the Church of England and throughout the Anglican Communion". It is to be supposed that the Chairman of the Commission, the Dean of Lincoln, would also share these sentiments, for in his address on worship to the Minneapolis Congress he said: "I venture to say that revisions of Prayer Books should be more modest in scope and less revolutionary than they commonly are. It must never be forgotten that the overwhelming majority of those who have to use the Prayer Book services are ordinary lay people. Most of them possess only meagre resources for appreciating the theological or liturgical reasons for alterations of what they have been accustomed to. . . . There is a gulf wider than is commonly supposed between those of us who decide on these questions and the great bulk of those who are affected by them. In a service not everywhere used in the Anglican Communion, there is an anathema which runs: 'Cursed is he that removeth his neighbour's landmark.' This might with advantage appear on the walls of every vestry, and in every conference hall where Church assemblies are gathered. For there are psychological and spiritual landmarks as well as material ones" (*The Anglican Congress 1954, Report, p. 95*).

The actual Report of the Liturgical Commission is very brief, no doubt due to the existence of the three earlier Convention reports on Baptism and Confirmation. Nevertheless this brevity is unfortunate, for the Report is open to some serious criticisms which, one charitably hopes, might have been allayed had certain explanations been given. We are told, for instance, that the work of the Commission is "an attempt to equip the Church with liturgical forms which will prove adaptable to the rapidly changing needs of the pastoral situation". We are not told what these needs are. When a new baptismal form—for adults—was introduced in 1662, four new needs were cited in the Preface as justifying the innovation. Certainly there are needs today which scarcely existed in 1662, such as the need of a ministry to baptized Anglicans who never go to church and the need to remove the barrier caused by the archaic diction of our liturgy; but the draft services do not seem to have such needs in mind. One suspects that "rapidly changing needs" is a cliché. There is more work for the bishop to do in these services, if that is meeting any need, and we do not wonder that two members of the Commission disapprove of two of the services because "in common use they would prove impracticable". In regard to liturgical diction, would it not be wise to defer the composition of new services until there has been opportunity to discover how far the language of the New English Bible may prove an acceptable vehicle for liturgical expression? Since no modern Cranmer has appeared on the scene, the solution of this problem may well wait on the appearance of a generally accepted literary version of the Scriptures. Surely there must be a modern way of saying, "Who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants."

* * * *

The Report is most seriously to be criticized for the principle on which the Commission claims to have based its work. "In setting about its task the Commission has endeavoured to apply the principle admirably set forth in Resolution 74(c) of the Lambeth Conference of 1958: 'A chief aim of Prayer Book Revision should be to further that recovery of the worship of the Primitive Church which was the aim of the compilers of the first Prayer Books of the Church of England.'" Three criticisms of this resolution, and hence of the work of the Liturgical Commission, must be made.

First, the Lambeth resolution fails to define what it means by "primitive". The claim of the resolution might have a certain plausibility if "the worship of the Primitive Church" were intended to mean the worship of the New Testament churches. But an examination of the report of the relevant committee of the Lambeth Conference, and of the Liturgical Commission's Report, shows that "primitive" is certainly not intended to be taken so narrowly. "Primitive" is clearly intended to extend at least to the fourth century. That some of the Reformers may have used "primitive" in this sense, may be allowed, and is an excellent reason why we should not ascribe to them the general aim of recovering the worship of the Primitive Church. For instance, open penance at the beginning of Lent is referred to in the Communion as having been practised "in the Primitive Church". This custom is not known to us earlier than the fourth century. But

however much the compilers of our Prayer Books may have desired the restoration of this particular "godly discipline", it would be fantastic to claim that they were intent on a general recovery of the worship of the fourth century.

The second criticism, then, is one of fact. It was *not* the aim of the compilers of the First English Prayer Books "to recover the worship of the Primitive Church". Certainly the Reformers made careful study of the worship of early centuries so far as they could. But their adoption or retention (and rejection!) of any ancient ceremony or form of words was altogether subject to another and higher test—the test of scriptural truth. They did not assume, as the Lambeth resolution appears to assume, that the worship of the Primitive Church was correct simply because it was primitive; nor do they, in their carefully written prefaces to their Prayer Books, commit themselves to any such principle as the Lambeth bishops attribute to them. Professor E. C. Ratcliff, speaking of the second Prayer Book of 1552 and noting that "it is a habit of liturgists to measure the new by the standard of the old" says: "Yet, in defence of the Second Book, Cranmer would argue that it should be judged in accordance with its success in conforming with an axiom which, upon his view, should control all liturgical expression. The axiom is that of Scriptural sanction. What cannot plainly be seen to possess Scriptural sanction should not be found in a Prayer Book" (*The Liturgical Work of Cranmer*, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, October 1956, reprinted in *Thomas Cranmer 1489-1556*, Church Information Board, 1956, p. 40). Dr. Ratcliff may think this ideal impossible, but at least he recognizes that the test applied by Cranmer was scriptural sanction and not conformity to the worship of the Primitive Church, except in the sense that "the perfect Prayer Book should provide people and ministers with forms of worship which the Apostles and first believers could acknowledge and approve" (*ibid.*).

Finally, whatever the Reformers or the Lambeth bishops may have meant by primitive, the principle enunciated by the resolution is fundamentally erroneous. *Reformed churchmen must protest with all their power against the notion that conformity with the primitive church or any other church is the criterion of worship.* The only true principle of worship is conformity with biblical revelation. The Church, even in New Testament days, was often at variance with that revelation. We are certainly not to emulate the Lord's Supper as we know it to have been celebrated in Corinth at one period. Nor are we to be followers of the prophetess Jezebel who had considerable influence in the church at Thyatira. Are we even to model ourselves on the great and truly primitive church at Jerusalem, observe the law of Moses, religiously circumcise our children, and break bread by households? One wonders if many who have the urge to recover the worship of the early church ever stop to think what it is they desire. It is not what was done at Jerusalem or Antioch or Corinth or Rome that must govern our worship today. Rather, it is what the inspired writers of the New Testament laid upon the churches. Sometimes, indeed, this was in the form of explicit traditions, but more basically it was in terms of general principles of decency, orderliness, and of conformity

with the gospel of grace and the law of love. Particular rites and ceremonies are, as our Prayer Book declares, "things in their own nature indifferent". It is "the gospel" and "the apostle" to which we must submit. How far the Primitive Church actually conformed its worship to this criterion, we simply do not know. But to seek to recover its worship for ourselves, rather than to submit to the Word of God in the Scriptures, is not only a vain, but a mistaken, aspiration.

* * * *

Wrong principle leads to wrong practice. The Commission claims that "from every point of view, pastoral, theological, and liturgical, Baptism and Confirmation must be viewed as two parts of one whole, and must further be associated as closely as possible with the Holy Communion". This is apparently an application of the principle about the recovery of the worship of the Primitive Church. No argument is adduced, nor is any historical reference given, to support this claim. Such a conjunction of rites cannot be justified from the New Testament. It certainly cannot be claimed that it was part of the worship of that Church. Confirmation as the Commission understands it simply did not exist in the New Testament, nor is any significance attributed there to a "first communion". The statement of the Bishop of Ripon in an appendix on the use of the term "Christian Initiation" in the report *Baptism Today* (1949) to the effect that "admission into membership of the Church of God, though it begins with Baptism, is not completed until communicant status has been reached", does not correspond to any situation known to us from the New Testament. If no biblical reason can be adduced for conjoining these rites, it is difficult to urge a compelling theological or liturgical reason. If there is a pastoral reason for the suggested procedure, let us be told what it is.

Justin Martyr, our earliest post-New Testament witness, makes no mention of any ceremony except baptism as constituting initiation into the church, unless we are to add the act of bringing the baptized person "to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, in order that we may offer hearty prayers in common for ourselves and for the illuminated (i.e. baptized) person, and for all others in every place, that we may be counted worthy, now that we have learned the truth, by our works also to be found good citizens and keepers of the commandments, so that we may be saved with an everlasting salvation" (1 *Apol.*, 65). Justin's *Apology* goes on to describe the Eucharist and other aspects of Christian worship, but no mention is made of the recently baptized person in this connection. Tertullian (c. A.D. 200) seems to be the first to tell that, after baptism and anointing with oil, "the hand is laid upon us"—he says not whose. This he mentions in *De baptismo*, 7, though he says nothing of it in *De corona*, 3 when he describes the various baptismal customs which are said to be traditional. The baptismal eucharist of Hippolytus (c. A.D. 225) is probably our first "first communion" considered as part of an initiatory rite, but it is significant that this eucharist has added to it two extra cups, one of water to signify inward baptism, and one of milk and honey to signify entrance into the promised land.

Exceptio probat regulam. The connection between baptism and either anointing or imposition of hands is notoriously confused from the end of the second century onward, and we have discovered no reason why the Lord's Supper should be thought of as part of Christian initiation.

The Commission must demonstrate the theological and biblical ground for forming into "one whole" the dominical sacrament of baptism and the later ecclesiastical rite of confirmation before it can expect Reformed churchmen to approve its draft services. It must also explain why participation in the other dominical sacrament, the Lord's Supper, should be thought necessary or desirable for one's first entry into the Church. There is nothing in the Communion itself which points to initiation. Indeed, it differs from Baptism precisely in this, that it presupposes "the fellowship of the Spirit", whereas Baptism initiates it. There will, of course, always be a first Communion, and like everything else done for the first time as a believer its meaning will be invested with special clarity, but the first Communion, no less than subsequent Communions, is meant as spiritual food for those who have continued with Christ in His temptations (Luke xxii. 28). In Baptism we put on Christ and enter by one Spirit into one Body (Gal. iii. 27, 1 Cor. xii. 13); let us not derogate from this dignity by a misinterpretation of the meaning of the Lord's Supper. The Reformers had a sounder instinct. They were well aware of the rites of early centuries, but they held that Baptism, as the sacrament of regeneration by the Spirit and incorporation into Christ, should stand alone as the sufficient mode of initiation into the Christian church.

Another source of confusion in the Commission's work arises from an insufficient grasp of the background of baptism in the New Testament. "In the New Testament Adult Baptism is the norm, and it is only in the light of this fact that the doctrine and practice of Baptism can be understood". The Commission therefore makes the baptism and confirmation of adults "the archetypal service". (Confirmation, apparently, for good measure. The Commission does not claim that this was the norm in the New Testament.) But what is meant by "norm"? We read of no baptisms in the Jerusalem church after Pentecost; but since its members continued to circumcise their children (Acts xxi. 20f.) it would be rash to assume that adult baptism was the norm there. Elsewhere, some individual adult baptisms are reported, like those of the eunuch, Paul, and "certain disciples" at Ephesus—all, including probably the eunuch, Jews. But generally the norm, if norm can be claimed, seems to have been household baptisms, where the element of normality lay, not in the adult status of the household constituents, but in their relationship to the head of the house (Acts xvi. 15, xvi. 33, xviii. 8 with 1 Cor. i. 14-16). If the Commission's desire to provide an archetypal service is sound, that service, should surely treat the household as a unit. In seeking the New Testament norm, moreover, the Commission has overlooked the important distinction between Jewish and Gentile converts. The truly archetypal character of any baptismal service will be seen, not in the age of the candidate, but in the doctrine of God's covenant which underlies it. Here, the main distinction would appear, not in the candidate's age, but in his background. The Commission's services

take no account of this distinction. Their archetypal service for an adult has Ezekiel xxxvi. 24-28 (God's promise of a new covenant with Israel) for the Old Testament lesson and Mark i. 1-11 (the baptism of John as the beginning of the gospel) for the Gospel. Both passages are highly suitable for the baptism of someone brought up under the old covenant and now experiencing the blessing of its spiritual fulfilment in the new covenant. But is this the kind of "archetypal adult" the Commission has in mind as likely to be coming for baptism in the Church of England? Contrariwise, the service for infant baptism has no Old Testament lesson, reads Galatians iv. 4-7 (Paul's assurance to his Gentile converts that they are no longer servants to false gods) for the Epistle and Matthew xxviii. 18-20 (the great commission to teach and baptize the Gentiles) for the Gospel, and generally proceeds as if the infant had no covenantal antecedents at all. The service would be admirable for a person converted from heathenism; it contains no hint (except indirectly in a final prayer which may be added at the minister's discretion) that the candidate may already be a member of a Christian household and "within the covenant". It says little for the Commission's grasp of covenant theology. Our Lord's blessing of the children has been dropped by the Commission as having "no obvious connection with Baptism". The passage is, nevertheless, an assurance of the promise of blessing which lies at the root of what has rightly been called "the biblical doctrine of infant baptism". An archetypal service which regards adult baptism as the norm is an anachronism in a long-established church.

* * * *

This brings us to a consideration of the general character of the draft services, recalling Canon Smyth's dictum that a good liturgy must make sense, and must make good sense when measured by the standard of the Bible.

Let us begin by seeing what sort of "sense" our 1662 services make. Their purposes are clearly set out in the various exhortations. The baptismal service is constructed as a covenant ceremony. The promise of God's blessing is declared, and the due response is then made by the candidate ("wherefore after this promise made by Christ, ye must also faithfully, for your part, promise . . ."). The verbal promises being exchanged, prayer is made that God will set apart the water for its sacramental use, i.e. that He will grant the full blessing of His covenant of grace to the person to be baptized. Baptism at once follows. The candidate receives the sign of the cross and is accepted into the congregation. Thanks are given for the benefits signified by baptism, and prayer is made that the candidate may "walk answerably to his Christian calling".

Baptism is shown clearly to be a sacrament of the gospel. In it, the gospel is proclaimed and believed. Moreover, the *whole* benefit of salvation—forgiveness, regeneration by the spirit, participation in Christ's death, membership in His body and the hope of eternal life—is offered by Christ and accepted by the believer. In all this there is logical coherence, and good sense when measured by the Bible. One may compare the "archetypal" baptism of Acts ii., where first the promise of the gospel (which is the promise of the covenant) is set

forth by Peter, where the people make the response of repentance and faith, are forthwith baptized, and thereby "added" to the church.

The meaning of our confirmation is equally clear. The medieval rite of confirmation had become confused and obscure. The English Reformers might, with good excuse, have discarded it altogether, for it was not a sacrament nor had it direct biblical precedent. But they retained a rite of confirmation—much altered—for a reason which was neither theological nor liturgical, but pastoral. This reason they state in the opening words of the service: "that children, being now come to the years of discretion . . . may themselves, with their own mouth and consent, ratify and confirm" their baptismal vows. The imposition of hands was added in lieu of the medieval anointing. The service indicated that there was New Testament precedent for such a gesture in "the example of thy holy Apostles". The meaning attributed to the act was "to certify them (the candidates) by this sign of thy favour and goodness towards them", and the act was accompanied by the prayer that the candidates might be strengthened in their life and witness by the continuing power of the Holy Spirit. Thus the Reformers did not claim that confirmation as such was a biblical rite—though they rightly claimed that imposition of hands with prayer was a biblical custom—nor did they set out to recover the kind of confirmation which had developed in the church from the time of Tertullian. Professor Lampe rightly says: "Confirmation as envisaged by the Reformers and as practised in accordance with the Prayer Book of 1552 and thereafter, has little in common with the rite that was performed, either as part of the baptismal service or as a separate act, in the Church of the early centuries, and it has no direct Scriptural precedent. Theologically, however, the Reformers were right. Their doctrine of confirmation made it possible to retain infant baptism along with the doctrine of justification *sola fide*. The Christian who was baptized in infancy was now able to make his necessary profession of faith after due instruction, and, on so supplying the deficiency which infant baptism would otherwise suffer, to receive the blessing of the representative leader of the Christian society with prayer for his strengthening and increase in the Holy Spirit" (*The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 314).

The draft services, on the other hand, are inferior to our present services both in their logical coherence (i.e. their "sense") and in their theology of baptism.

First, we find a restoration of the thoroughly medieval idea of "The Blessing of the Water", which, moreover, is regarded by the compilers as "the principal prayer in each service", so that "an attempt has been made to express the whole biblical doctrine of Baptism" therein. The objection to this procedure is twofold. First, the "blessing" of inanimate objects has no biblical basis. The expression is sometimes used as an ellipsis for blessing or thanking God *for* some object or other (as when at the Last Supper Jesus blessed bread, i.e. gave thanks to God for it), but it has never been customary to offer thanks to God for the water, as such, at a baptismal service. Nor, as a matter of fact, are thanks offered to God for the water in the Commission's "Blessing of the Water". When the rubric says

"the Bishop . . . shall bless the water with the following prayer", it uses "bless" in a non-biblical sense, and restores the Romish notion of sanctifying the water which the Reformers deliberately discarded since it seemed to imply an imparting of mystical properties to material elements. The Reformers frequently maintained that "blessing the water" was not an original or necessary part of the sacrament; "consecration" was for them merely a setting apart for a sacred use. The second objection to "The Blessing of the Water", then, is that it represents a moving away from this Reformed position. (If the words "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin" are not going to be used in the Reformed sense, Evangelicals should press for their alteration or deletion. As it is, they are practically meaningless to a modern congregation.) That the service is open to this objection is shown by the fact that "The Blessing of the Water" *precedes* any confession of faith or expressed desire for baptism on anyone's part. The water is blessed in advance, with the prayer that all to be baptized in it will be made members of God's church, without any promises having been made, and no occasion for its use having been certified. The "sense" of the service, especially its covenantal character, is weakened by this order. Similarly, the declaration of the bishop: "Know then that God will favourably receive these persons, who truly repent and come to Him by faith": should surely follow, not precede, the promises made by the candidates.

The Commission has endeavoured to express "the whole biblical doctrine of Baptism" in the prayer for "The Blessing of the Water". This being so, one would have expected to find the relation between Christ's death and the forgiveness of our sins clearly stated. Five paragraphs are devoted to the work of Christ, from creation to ascension, but His work of atonement for sin is confined to the statement: "Who was by thee delivered up for the suffering of death, that he might purify unto himself a People for his own possession." This seems an unduly refined statement of the basis of our forgiveness, especially when compared with the statement of the doctrine of atonement in our Communion consecration prayer ("who made there, by his one oblation of himself, once offered, etc."), and even with the brief statement of our present baptismal service: "Who for the forgiveness of our sins did shed out of His most precious side both water and blood."

* * * *

The most radical change in the new services, however, is the turning of confirmation into a ceremony for the receiving of the gift of the Holy Spirit. "It is unfortunate," says the reviewer in the S.P.C.K.'s *View-Review* of November 1959, "that . . . the Confirmation rubrics endorse the 'Mason-Dix-Thornton' view that the sending of the Spirit takes place only when the baptized person is confirmed . . . The service of Confirmation for those baptized in infancy goes to extreme lengths in its expression of the theologically impossible doctrines that Christian children live without the indwelling Spirit until they are confirmed." Yet one has the uneasy feeling that this new emphasis is meant to be the *pièce-de-résistance* of the whole

revision. Be that as it may, the result is confusion and contradiction. Most seriously, baptism is no longer a sacrament of the whole blessing of salvation, as it undoubtedly is in the New Testament. There is plenty of stress on being "born again in baptism" and on receiving forgiveness of sins therein. But when we ask does baptism signify the giving of the Holy Spirit? the answer is, at best, equivocal. True, the Bishop assures the congregation that "God will give (the candidates for baptism) remission of their sins and the gift of His Spirit". But it is still necessary for him to say at Confirmation: "These persons have been baptized; they have been instructed in the Christian religion; and they now come with repentance and faith to receive the Spirit." In the archetypal service of Confirmation, instead of our present prayer "Strengthen them, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace", we have "Send down from heaven upon them thy Holy Ghost the Comforter". The confusion is not dispersed when, with studied ambiguity, the Bishop lays his hand on the candidate and says: "Confirm, O Lord, thy servant with thy Holy Spirit, that he may continue thine for ever". The compilers say this wording is designedly equivocal so as to express "two different ways of looking at confirmation". They also "suggest" that these two ways are not mutually exclusive, and hope the wording will satisfy both "those who think of Confirmation primarily as *augmentum ad robur* and those who regard it as Χρῆσις τελειωτική." Whether these two parties will be satisfied by the wording, it is for them to say. The people it does not satisfy are those who, with the Reformers, regard Confirmation as primarily a confirming of baptismal vows, with the laying on of hands with prayer a contingent act of blessing. And it is difficult to imagine that anyone can prefer the new prayer "Confirm, O Lord, etc." to "Defend, O Lord, this thy child with thy heavenly grace, etc."

The most exhaustive recent *exposé* of the type of confirmation theology which underlies the draft services and of the attempt to find scriptural precedent for the rite in Acts viii and xix, is Professor Lampe's *The Seal of the Spirit* to which reference has already been made. His thesis has been anticipated, however, in a vigorous passage in James Calfhill's *Answer to John Martiall's Treatise of the Cross*. Calfhill was Archdeacon of Colchester and in 1570 was nominated by Elizabeth to succeed Edwyn Sandys as Bishop of Worcester, but he died before he could take up office. In his answer to the Fourth Article (Parker Society ed., pp. 216f.) he wrote: "Is Baptism insufficient without Confirmation? Is Baptism available, as the Decree hath, only for them that should die straight; and Confirmation for them that should live longer? Doth Baptism only regenerate us to life, but Confirmation furnish us unto the fight? What is it then that Paul hath: 'We are buried with Christ by Baptism into His death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life . . . ?' But, by this their device, they take away half the effect of Baptism; rejecting therein the commandment of God, to establish their own tradition. Wherefore I will reason with you as Christ did with the Pharisees. Is the Confirmation (which you call a Sacrament) ordained to be so from heaven, or of men? If

it be of men, it is no Sacrament. If it be of God, then show the Word. Ye have the example of the Apostles in the chs. viii and xix of the Acts : but no example sufficeth for a Sacrament. But see how well ye follow the example. 'When the Apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard say that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John : which, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For as yet He was come down on none of them ; but they were baptized only, in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.' Now, are ye ignorant what here is meant by the Holy Ghost ? I will tell you. The gift to speak in divers languages ; to work miracles ; and other particular graces of the Holy Spirit. And although they had received the common grace of adoption and regeneration through Baptism ; yet had they not these other qualities, which in the beginning of the Church were granted, and now be denied. So that laying on of hands served to good use then, when it pleased God at instance of the Apostles' prayers to confer the visible graces of His Spirit ; but now that there is no such ministry in the Church ; now that miracles be ceased ; to what end should we have this imposition of hands ; the sign without the thing ? "

* * * *

Finally, we draw attention to certain features in the proposed administration of baptism which differ from the tradition of the Church of England as it has been since the Reformation and, in some cases, from a much earlier period.

The most surprising of these features is the omission from infant baptism of the Apostles' Creed as the test of Christian faith. Its place is taken by a new form modelled on wording from the Catechism relating to belief in the Trinity only. This omission is odd, to say the least, in view of the Lambeth Quadrilateral's stipulation of "the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal symbol". The compilers say it has been done for "pastoral reasons", whatever that may mean.

Another odd feature, which seems un-eirenic when church union is in the air, is the dropping of immersion as a legitimate mode of baptism for adults, though it is retained for infant baptism alongside affusion. All Christians regard dipping as a legitimate mode of baptism, and it should therefore be retained among the provisions for all services.

The Commission has enjoined, in both its baptismal services, a method of administering the water never before prescribed in the Church of England. The new rubric reads, in the archetypal service : "the minister . . . shall pour water upon him three times, once at the mention of each person of the Trinity" ; and in the service for infants : "The Priest . . . shall dip him in the water three times, or pour water upon him three times, once at the mention of each Person of the Trinity." One is aware that there are clergymen who perform baptism in this way at present, yet never before has the Church of England ordered a triple *affusion*, and never before has it specified that a mode should be repeated "once at the mention of each Person of the Trinity". Why should it do so now, and not as a permissive variation but as an obligation ? Triple immersion may have been part

of the worship of the "Primitive" (but not the New Testament) Church, as it is mentioned by Tertullian. Yet more than once in church history it has been considered desirable to discard a triple action, notwithstanding its Trinitarian symbolism. It was relinquished in parts of Europe following the Arian controversy because of its susceptibility to being interpreted as denoting a division in the three Persons of the Godhead. Gregory the Great pronounced against trine immersion and the 6th canon of the Council of Toledo in A.D. 633 ordered single immersion to be practised throughout Spain, which became the rule in that church. Again, the English Reformers deliberately discarded trine immersion—yet another example, despite the recent Lambeth resolution, of their refusal to be bound by "the worship of the Primitive Church". In the first Prayer Book they retained a modified form in which the infant was not wholly dipped thrice but was immersed in three stages: "First dipping the right side; second the left side; the third time dipping the face toward the front." Affusion was allowed if the child was weak, but in this case, contrary to the current Romish custom, one action only was required. The second Book of 1552 quite discarded the triple action. To judge from the writings of Cranmer, Becon, and others who discuss the matter, this was on the ground that such customs (along with unction, giving milk and honey, blessing the water etc.) were not apostolical or necessary parts of the sacrament, and should not be allowed to cause confusion in the mind of the worshipper as to what is essential to the sacrament. Since we acknowledge one baptism, not three, for the remission of sins, and are baptized into one Name of God, not three names, there is every reason why we should prefer the simplest and clearest mode possible for the actual administration of this ordinance ordained by Christ Himself. There is still much to be said for the argument of the fourth Council of Toledo: "And lest any man should doubt of the mystery of this sacrament, why we allow but one dipping, he may see therein our death and resurrection. For the dipping into the water is as it were the going down into the grave; and the coming up again out of the water is the rising again out of the grave. Also he may perceive, that therein is showed the unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the persons. The unity is figured, when we dip once; the Trinity when we baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Bullinger, who quotes this extract, adds: "This I do not allege to stay myself upon man's testimony; but by man's testimony to shew, that it is free to follow that which serveth most to the edifying of the church" (*Fifth Decade*, ch. viii).

A striking and original feature of the Anglican service since 1552 has been the reception of the candidate after baptism, in the words: "We receive this (child) into the congregation of Christ's flock." This reception, which gives liturgical expression to the "adding" to the church of those being saved (Acts ii. 41) and recalls Justin's reference to bringing the newly baptized to the brethren, is now omitted. No explanation of the omission is offered. Canon 30 of 1604 draws attention to an implication of this ceremony of reception: "It is apparent in the Communion Book that the infant baptized is, by virtue of baptism, before it be signed with the sign of the Cross,

received into the congregation of Christ's flock, as a perfect member thereof." The Commission's theology of confirmation obviously casts doubt on whether the infant baptized *is* a perfect member of the Church, and we assume that the reception "into the congregation of Christ's flock" at baptism has been omitted lest it would appear to "beat the gun".

The signing with the cross is retained, but without the important safeguard of a reference to Canon 30 for "the true explication and the just reasons for the retaining of it". Unfortunately, Canon 30 itself will disappear if the new draft canons are accepted. Draft Canon 33, on the Sign of the Cross, is not an adequate substitute. This being so, Evangelicals might well press for the ceremony to be discarded altogether. It was only retained at the cost of alienating many earnest churchmen in the 16th and 17th centuries. The Commission itself reports, in its Introduction, that it has "caused confusion in people's minds" in modern times. At least it ought to be made optional. This is what the Commission allows in the case of another ceremony, which they have revived, viz., the ceremony of handing a lighted candle to the baptized person. This latter was in the medieval services, but even the first prayer Book of 1549 discarded it as impracticable, though that Book retained the giving of a white robe and anointing as post-baptismal ceremonies. It seems foolish to revive it today, even as an option.

* * * *

It would not be fair to suggest that the draft services contain no commendable features. The provision of additional lections and psalmody, for example, should be generally welcomed, especially if baptism is administered apart from other services. The breaking of the interrogatory Creed into sections is also an improvement. Yet the services contain an inordinate number of unnecessary and irritating additions especially in the rubrics. "The Font shall be emptied in such a way as to secure the reverent disposal of the water": this is presumably desirable now that the water is to be "blessed". In the much stressed "Prayer for the sending of the Spirit" in Confirmation, we have the bishop "stretching forth his hands toward those who are to be confirmed". Notwithstanding that liturgical processions are still illegal in the Church of England, a section of the service is labelled, "The Procession to the Font" for which a psalm is provided, and provision is also made for a psalm or hymn to be sung "during the entry of the ministers". When baptism is ministered without confirmation at the Holy Communion, the priest "shall not minister Holy Communion to the newly-baptized", but no indication is given that the newly baptized should withdraw from the service. Godparents are bidden to see that their godchildren "are brought in due time to . . . Holy Communion". This exceeds the function of a godparent; coming to Communion is always a matter for the discretion of the communicant.

The Lambeth Conference committee on the Prayer Book in 1958 made this cautious statement: "While much thought has recently been given to the theology of Christian Initiation, the stage has not yet been reached where the new knowledge can be assimilated and fresh

conclusions can be put forward what would be generally accepted . . . it is to be hoped that an opportunity may be given for a full consideration of the theology of Christian Initiation at the next Lambeth Conference " (Lambeth Report, 2. 86). The unsatisfactory character of the Liturgical Commission's draft services underlines the wisdom of this statement, and it is certainly to be hoped that no attempt will be made to implement the use of these services at least until after the next Lambeth Conference has had opportunity to consider the theological issues raised by them. A conservative revision of our present services, especially of their diction, may well be desirable. But neither the Liturgical Commission's report nor the previous Convocation reports have made out a case—such as Reformed churchmen can recognize—for the need of new services based on new liturgical and theological principles. A close study of the draft services convinces us that "the old is better". The Lambeth Committee's report, above quoted, goes on to suggest that in any baptismal service twelve specified elements "need to find liturgical expression". Allowing that one of these, "The Blessing of the Water," is nothing other than—to quote the report itself—"a thanksgiving for Christ's baptism and the benefits of His redeeming work and prayer for the fruits of baptism in those to be baptized", we may well take comfort in the fact that every one of these twelve elements already finds liturgical expression in our 1662 Prayer Book services.

Confirmation in the Church Today

BY THE EDITOR

THE difficulties and complications attaching to a discussion of the question of Confirmation result very largely from the fact that it is, as Professor G. W. H. Lampe in his important book *The Seal of the Spirit* has said, "a rite for whose administration we cannot find direct Scriptural instructions" (p. 80). This being so, it is imperative that Confirmation, in common with other traditions and ceremonies of the Church, should comply with the liturgical principle expressed in Article XXXIV, "that nothing be ordained against God's Word".

* * * *

The New Testament passages which have been adduced in connection with Confirmation are few in number, and we may look at them briefly. First of all, however, it should be emphasized that in the New Testament there is no suggestion that Baptism is in itself inadequate or incomplete, as though needing to be followed by some other ceremony. Thus on the Day of Pentecost the 3,000 persons who "received Peter's word" were baptized, but there is no mention of any other rite having been administered (Acts iii. 41). The same was the case with individual converts such as the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 36), Lydia (Acts xvi. 15), the Philippian jailer (Acts xvi. 33), and also Cornelius and his household (Acts x. 47f.).

There are, it is true, certain passages in which through the laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was apparently bestowed on persons who had previously been baptized. In Acts viii. 14ff. we read that when the Apostles at Jerusalem heard of the way the message had been received in Samaria they sent Peter and John who, after prayer, laid their hands on the converts so that they might receive the Holy Spirit. If, as some have wished to maintain, this was the invariable apostolic practice and it was by this means that the gift of the Holy Spirit was regularly conferred, then, as Professor Lampe observes, "it is exceedingly odd that, in all the space which he devotes to baptismal teaching, St. Paul never once alludes to it," and, further, "that the performance of the rite is not one of the many ministerial charismata described by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 4-10" (p. 67). Indeed, in the case of Cornelius and his household the descent of the Spirit *preceded* the administration of Baptism (Acts x. 44). Acts xix. 1-7 describes how, when Paul came to Ephesus, he found a dozen disciples there who had been baptized with the Baptism of John (the Baptist) but who not only had not received the Holy Spirit, but had not so much as heard that there was a Holy Spirit. He thereupon baptized them into the name of the Lord Jesus, and when he had laid his hands on them the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied. In Acts ix. 17f. Ananias, laying his hands on Saul of Tarsus, explains that he had been sent by the Lord Jesus in order that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit; and it was only *after* this that Saul was baptized.

Thus we see that even in those instances where the laying on of hands takes place, no fixed pattern emerges. The laying on of hands may precede or it may follow baptism, but more often it seems not to have taken place at all. That it was by no means indispensable for the reception of the Spirit is apparent, for example, from the case of Cornelius.

How can this absence of pattern be explained, knowing, as we do, that St. Luke was a careful writer who cannot be dismissed as a muddle-head? Space does not permit a discussion here of the various theories and interpretations that have been advanced, some of them dictated by pre-judgment of the issues involved; but we agree with Professor Lampe that the conferment of the Holy Spirit in Samaria, in Cæsarea (Cornelius=first Gentile convert), and Ephesus (which became the centre of the Gentile mission) may best be understood as a sort of repetition of Pentecost, visibly demonstrating that the outpouring of the Spirit was upon Samaritan and Gentile as well as Jewish believers. In this respect it seems significant that, as in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 4), the bestowal of the Spirit was followed in the Cæsarean and Ephesian episodes by speaking with tongues and prophecy.

Another instance in the New Testament Church of the laying on of hands is that of the commissioning of the seven deacons (Acts vi. 1ff.). Here, as at Samaria later, the laying on of hands is preceded by prayer; but there is no mention of a descent of the Holy Spirit, for, presumably, these seven had been among the 3,000 on whom the Spirit had descended on the Day of Pentecost—indeed, Stephen at least is described as a man full of the Holy Spirit prior to the laying on of the Apostles' hands (Acts vi. 5).

A consideration of the evidence leads Professor Lampe to conclude that the laying on of hands in these New Testament passages is "a sign of association in the apostolic or missionary task of the Church," a token of "incorporation into the apostolic ministry," "a commissioning for active service in the missionary enterprise" (pp. 76, 78). This interpretation would seem to accord well with what St. Paul says to Timothy about the laying of his own and of the presbytery's hands on him (2 Tim. i. 6, 1 Tim. iv. 14), and again with his admonition to Timothy to lay hands hastily on no man (1 Tim. v. 22).

The somewhat cryptic allusion in Heb. vi. 2 to "the teaching of baptisms (R.V. mg.: washing—*βαπτισμῶν*, not *βαπτισμάτων*) and of laying on of hands" (*ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν*), if it refers, as the context seems to suggest, to a ceremony granted to converts in general, would, says Professor Lampe, "be a highly significant piece of symbolism . . . marking their fellowship with the brethren in the active tasks of Church life" (p. 78)—a gesture of welcome into the community of believers. Whether the rite of Confirmation as now practised may legitimately be explained as a development from this root will depend in the main on the particular doctrine that we associate with Confirmation. It must be remembered, however, that not until the latter part of the second century is there any evidence at all of a regular rite of Confirmation in the Church. The most that can be said is that early Christian pictures in the Roman catacombs suggest that the officiant

held his hand on the candidate's head *at the time of the Baptism*. In the absence of any more precise information, it is of course impossible to draw conclusions from evidence of this kind; but at any rate it leaves us still without any indication of the existence of a second and supplementary rite distinct from Baptism.

* * *

We find a different situation, however, when we come to the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, which may be taken to reflect the practice in the Church of Rome at the beginning of the third century. In the process of preparation and initiation described here, there are several layings on of hands. Thus the catechumens, who are required to submit to a three-year course of preparation, at the end of each instruction pray together, in separation from the congregation of baptized worshippers, and then the instructor lays his hands on them with prayer before dismissing them. The baptismal service itself takes place at cockcrow on Easter Day, and on the eve of that festival the bishop lays his hands on the catechumens for the purpose of exorcizing all evil spirits from them. He further shuts the door, so to speak, after the departing evil spirits, by sealing the foreheads, ears, and noses of the candidates with the prophylactic sign of the Cross. Following their renunciation of Satan and all his works, the candidates are then anointed with the "oil of exorcism". They are thereupon baptized with three immersions (or affusions?). A presbyter then anoints them with the "oil of thanksgiving" and leads them to the congregation where the bishop lays his hand upon them with prayer, anoints them with "holy oil" in the name of the Trinity, seals them on the forehead, and gives them the kiss of peace.

This involved ceremonial seems far removed from the simplicity of the New Testament. Nevertheless, it is interesting to notice that it forms a *unity*: there are not two distinct and separate rites. The later separation between Baptism and the laying on of hands no doubt came about largely as a result of the notion that, while Baptism was ordinarily administered by a presbyter, the imposition of hands should be reserved to the bishop. As the Church grew, Baptisms would more and more frequently take place in the absence of the bishop and would thus tend to divide what had formerly been one into two different ceremonies, held at different times and possibly in different places. This in turn leads to doctrinal adjustments.

Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, finds a parallel or precedent for two separate ceremonies in the account in Acts of the sending of Peter and John to pray and lay their hands on the Samaritan converts, who had previously been baptized, so that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Thus the unfortunate conception began to gain currency that the receiving of the Holy Spirit was associated, not with Baptism, but with the laying on of hands, or Confirmation. Baptism tends now to become a mere preliminary to the rite of Confirmation. The attempt is even made (for example, in the anonymous third century *De Rebaptismate*) to justify this radical distinction by interpreting John iii. 5—"except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—to mean by "water" Baptism, and by "the Spirit" the laying on of the bishop's hands

whereby the Holy Spirit was supposedly conferred. "The chief lesson that the study of the Fathers has to teach us on the subject of Baptism and Confirmation," says Professor Lampe, "is that, from the time when the Pauline teaching had given way to a conception which associated the gift of the indwelling Spirit with external rites rather than with the believer's faith-union with Christ, the thought of the early Church was at least as muddled as our own is today" (p. 185).

* * * *

As we consider the contemporary situation in which we are placed, it is, surely, plain that there is need for a careful rethinking of the whole question of Confirmation. This must be done, primarily, in subservience to the authority of the teaching of the New Testament. We must go back farther than the writings of the patristic authors of the third century, otherwise the complexities, aberrations, and confusions of their practice and teaching will lead us only deeper into the maze of contradictions in which so many are lost at the present time.

The question may even be asked whether, in view of the frailty of the evidence and the conflict of voices, Confirmation ought to be retained by the Church at all. In response to this question, however, Bishop Jewel, that great Anglican theologian of the sixteenth century, gives a clear affirmative: "The use and order of Confirmation rightly used is profitable and necessary in the church, and no way to be broken" (*Treatise on the Sacraments*, Parker Society edition, p. 1125). The operative words are, of course, "rightly used." Our Reformers, indeed, regarded Confirmation in the light of *infant* Baptism as the normal practice in a Christian community, and it is in this light that it takes on particular significance. Thus Jewel defines Confirmation as "so called because that which was done on our behalf in Baptism is ratified and confirmed" (*ibid.*). The dignity of a sacrament is denied to it because "Christ did not command it: He spake no word of it" (p. 1126). The Roman Catholic doctrine that the matter of Confirmation is episcopally consecrated oil, and the form the consignation of the candidate by the bishop with the sign of the cross, with the words, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the oil of salvation," is repudiated. "It agreeth not with our Christian faith to give the power of salvation unto oil," comments Jewel. "... It is no fit instrument, without commandment or promise by the word, to work salvation" (*ibid.*).

Least of all did the Reformers wish Confirmation to be esteemed at the expense of Baptism, as though it were more honourable because it was administered by a bishop and bestowed more than was promised in Baptism. "Whosoever is baptized," says Bishop Jewel again, "receiveth thereby the full name of a perfect Christian, and hath the full and perfect covenant and assurance of salvation: he is perfectly buried with Christ, doth perfectly put on Christ, and is perfectly made partaker of His resurrection" (*ibid.*).

So also the Book of Common Prayer speaks of the purpose of Confirmation as "a ratifying and confirming", "openly before the Church," of those promises which were made on the child's behalf in Baptism, and as a solemn undertaking by those who present themselves for Confirmation that "by the grace of God they will evermore

endeavour themselves faithfully to observe such things as they, by their own confession, have assented unto". The bishop prays that God will "strengthen them . . . with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them (His) manifold gifts of grace". Then, laying his hand on each candidate in turn, he says: "Defend, O Lord, this Thy child with Thy heavenly grace, that he may continue Thine for ever, and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come unto Thy everlasting kingdom". The significance of the laying on of the bishop's hands is indicated in the Collect of the Confirmation Service as being "to certify them (by this sign) of (God's) favour and gracious goodness towards them".

* * *

In the proposed new form of service (as set forth in the *Report on Baptism and Confirmation* of the Liturgical Commission) for the ministration of Confirmation to those who have previously been baptized as infants, there is evidence of a change of doctrine. The Old Testament Lesson is Joel ii. 28ff., in which the promise of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh is given. The Lesson for the Epistle is taken from Acts i. 3ff., in which our Lord promises His disciples that they will shortly be baptized with the Holy Spirit. The Gospel is John xiv. 15ff., where again our Lord promises His disciples that the Father will give them "another Comforter . . . even the Spirit of truth". In his Homily, moreover, the bishop announces that he will pray "that the same Spirit, who was given to the Apostles by the Lord Christ at Pentecost, may be given to these persons by the same Christ at the prayer of His Church, when they receive the laying on of hands". It would, in fact, seem that their Baptism is conceived of as having been only an *anointing* of the Spirit, in some quasi-external sense, but not as having guaranteed or sealed the *indwelling* of the Holy Spirit.

Now, it is not unfair to conclude that this new form of service is founded upon the presupposition that Baptism is but *water-baptism* whereas Confirmation is *Spirit-baptism*. If this is so, then Confirmation is something very much more than Baptism, for if the Spirit is fully, pentecostally (!), given only in Confirmation, then He can be no more than partially or externally present at Baptism. To derogate from the value and dignity of Baptism in this way has no warrant in the New Testament. Indeed, were the presupposition we have mentioned correct, it would surely require the clearest possible sanction of the New Testament.

In the form of service proposed by this same *Report* for the ministration of Baptism and Confirmation to those who are of age to answer for themselves this implicit derogation of Baptism is still noticeable. It is a very low view of Baptism that makes possible the prayer, in the *immediately following* Confirmation, that God will send down the Holy Ghost the Comforter upon those who have just been baptized. It is, however, in line with the explanation given in the Introduction that "the Commission has aimed at emphasizing the centrality of the prayer for the coming of the Spirit".

The *Report* is to be applauded for envisaging, in the case of adults, the administration of both Baptism and Confirmation at one and

the same time. For the two to be separated by an interval of time is (except in unusual circumstances) both confusing and harmful. The adult convert who has made public confession of faith in Baptism may justifiably demand what deficiency there is in his Baptism and why he should be required to wait until he has been confirmed before being admitted to the sacrament of Holy Communion. In the case of adult Baptism, indeed, the Prayer Book rubric (which is also incorporated into the rubrics of the *Report*) would seem to regard the ensuing Confirmation ("so soon after his baptism as conveniently may be") as little more than a ticket of admission to Holy Communion ("that so he may be admitted to the Holy Communion").

In the case of those who are baptized as adults it is, we suggest, desirable to regard and accordingly to formulate the service of Confirmation as the official act of welcoming and commissioning them into the ranks of the Church Militant here in earth by the bishop, who is the chief shepherd and father in God of the Church in his own particular district. "If", says Professor Lampe, "Confirmation were restored to its ancient place as an integral part of an adult believer's initiation, its purpose would be primarily to convey the blessing of the bishop to a new member of his flock, and a commission to take his place as an active partner in the Church's apostolic task" (p. 316).

We must, moreover, always be very careful about linking the operation or the impartation of the Holy Spirit to any external ceremony. The Holy Spirit is not bound. He filled John the Baptist from his mother's womb (Luke i. 15); He descended in pentecostal power upon Cornelius and his household *before* they were baptized; He came upon the Samaritan believers *after* they were baptized. These, however, were abnormal events, adapted to the inaugural acts of Christ's Church. It is important for us to recognize that in the normal course of established Church life the Christian sacraments presuppose the *prior* operation of the Holy Spirit. The infant children of believing parents are baptized not in order that they may be brought into relationship with the Holy Spirit's activity, but because they are *already*, in accordance with God's covenant, within the sphere of His grace. And believers who, having been baptized in childhood or in later years, come forward for confirmation do so not because they are strangers to the power of the Holy Spirit, but because that very power has *already* by God's grace been imparted and brought them to salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus.

Let those who hold a different, *ex opere operato*, view remember the sobering testimony of the statistics now available, which reveal that the great majority of those who are baptized and confirmed lapse entirely from the fellowship of the Church. The outward form without the inward grace is significant of superstition or of judgment, or both. The original pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit is, in every age, precisely what makes possible the inward response of faith, and makes real to every believing heart the presence and power of the glorified Saviour. This truth, however, is not incompatible with praying for the strengthening with the Holy Spirit, day by day, of those who believe in Christ; for all progress in the Christian life is the result of the sanctifying and deepening spiritual work of the Third Person of the blessed Trinity.

The Bible and Anglican Piety

Following up the Lambeth Conference

BY RONALD WILLIAMS

THE first of the five main subjects discussed at the Lambeth Conference in 1958 was the Bible—its authority and message. I myself had the privilege of serving on the Committee which prepared the report on this subject. Our distinguished Chairman was the Archbishop of York and his deep theological insight made a great contribution to the work and subsequent findings of the Committee, and eventually of the Conference. It is not necessary here to go over again the ground which was covered in the Report, for this has been widely read and studied. The final resolution on the subject, however, was Resolution 12, which called on the Churches of the Anglican Communion to engage in a special effort during the next ten years to deepen the quality and extend the scope of both personal and corporate study of the Bible.

In January of this year the Convocation of Canterbury unanimously accepted a resolution of my own, seconded by Canon Sansbury of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in which we called upon the dioceses of the Province of Canterbury to do their best to implement the special resolution of Lambeth on the next ten years.

It can be said already that the resolution has not fallen entirely on deaf ears. Response has perhaps been more marked in some of the overseas dioceses than in England. In Canada, for instance, the Bishop of Huron has taken up the matter in a big way and the resources of the Bible Reading Fellowship in England have been taxed to the utmost in order to provide him with the material he needed for a great campaign of personal Bible reading. The Church of Australia is planning a special Bible year in 1962, taking as its starting point the tercentenary of the Authorized Version of the Bible and the publication of the New Testament in the new revision. The primary motive of the campaign in Australia will not be so much the commemoration of a past event as the re-enthusing of the Church with the message and power of the Bible.

In England there have been some encouraging signs. I know of at least two diocesan Conferences which have devoted (or will devote) sessions to this subject (those of Hereford and Lincoln) and there may well be others. In the Diocese of Hereford all Rural Deanery Chapters have been addressed by one of their Prebendaries, and a valuable scheme of study for the clergy drawn up and circulated. The Bible Reading Fellowship has noticed a considerable increase in the circulation of its various publications and feels encouraged to press ahead with a number of new ventures aimed at meeting the new needs which are everywhere apparent. The Scripture Union, which for so long has provided the introduction to Bible reading for so many, continues its wide-ranging work. From time to time I see boys and girls at my Confirmations wearing the Scripture Union badge. I always comment

on it when shaking hands with them and ask them whether they have read their passage for the day ! Many of them have been drawn into the Scripture Union by branches at their schools or in Crusader classes. All this is encouraging.

* * * *

It would, however, in my view be a mistake to think that a little ripple on the surface of the Church's life is sufficient of itself to alter the direction of the main current. Although it is extremely difficult to form definite and objective views, many of us have a hunch that the total amount of Bible reading in the Church at large is disappointingly small. Scraps of definite evidence can be quoted in order to give some scientific basis for this opinion. The most definite information I have comes from a book, *The Communication of Ideas*, by T. Cauter and J. S. Downham, published a few years ago. It is based on a well-conducted Social Survey in the town of Derby, a fairly typical provincial city. Their findings reveal that out of 1,200 people interviewed, 11 per cent claimed to read the Bible frequently, 6 per cent fairly often, and 59 per cent never. 24 per cent claimed to be occasional readers. It was surprising and challenging to find that as between the various Churches the Church of England scored the largest percentage of nevers (62 per cent), the Roman Catholics the next largest (54 per cent), and the Free Churches the lowest (51 per cent). The inverse proportion was found among the frequent readers : 8 per cent Church of England, 18 per cent Free Church, and 14 per cent Roman Catholic.

The figures are, of course, influenced by the fact that the Church of England, being the Established Church, carries the largest number of nominal members. This should not divert our minds from the seriousness of the problem as far as the Church of England is concerned. We have recently had a shock in the form of the poor standard of Bible knowledge revealed in applicants for membership of a Church Training College for Teachers, and quite apart from these definite items of news, all clergy who think about the matter will agree that definite and intelligent interest in biblical matters is found among only a few of their people. Anglican piety, such as it is, has come to revolve round other matters. Many of these are entirely admirable—more frequent Communion, new liturgical observances and customs, house-to-house visitation, new forms of publicity, church building and so on. It would be wrong to try to grade these matters into any definite order. They all have their place. Nevertheless, some of us believe that without a settled habit of Bible reading on the part of the people, the quality of Christian discipleship is bound to be poor. The effect on preaching is disastrous because where there is little knowledge there is little stimulus to the preacher to draw deeply from his own resources of biblical knowledge and insight. He has to spend all his time evoking what little interest he can instead of coming to an audience hungry for what he has to give.

The reasons for this lack of personal Bible reading are of course many. Perhaps the most important is the abundance of cheap reading material pouring out every day from the newspaper presses and from publishing firms. Another difficulty is the fact that reading material

is provided for the masses in forms which make practically no intellectual demand upon them and to concentrate even on a few verses of small print in slightly archaic language is more than most people can accomplish unless their hearts have been very definitely warmed so that they have a spiritual taste for God's Message through His Word.

Tides are moving, however, in ways which in the end should bring about a real improvement. One such tide is the increasing interest in what is called Biblical Theology in almost all sections of the younger clergy. While this is nothing new in the Evangelical world many who would not wish to claim that name are aware of the importance of the Bible and its fundamental attitudes as formative of the doctrine and liturgical practice of the Church. It must be noticed that the Roman Catholic Church on the Continent is going ahead by leaps and bounds in a newly-found zeal for the popularizing of Bible knowledge. The Roman Catholics in France for instance are making wide use of a book known as the *Missel biblique*, a kind of handbook for the Mass in which the biblical material is clearly set out and explained. They are also going ahead with popular brochures set out in large print with attractive illustrations opening up biblical themes. I have one of these myself called *Bible et Natur* in which the bearing of the biblical message on man's attitude to nature, the soil and so on, is clearly brought out. On bookstalls of French Churches (I saw one myself at Sacré Coeur) cheap Gospels and New Testaments are on sale; indeed, it may come as a shock to my readers if I say that the French Roman Catholic Church shows much more zeal for personal Bible reading than does the Church of England.

Occasionally one has a pleasant surprise. I was visiting recently the wonderful old Norman Church at Melbourne, a great showplace and not, as far as I know, particularly "Evangelical". On the litany desk at the front of the nave a good copy of the Bible was open with an arrow pointing to the Gospel for the week and a nice card quoting the Sunday in question and giving the exact passage set for the week. Whether in practice many tourists would take the trouble to read it no one can say, but at any rate there was a pointed suggestion that valuable truth was to be had for the asking from the Word of God. I think this idea is worth pursuing, particularly in Churches which have many visitors.

* * * *

The hardest thing in any article of this kind is to indicate practical lines of progress and advance. These things cannot really be organized. They depend on the wind of the Spirit and the response of men and women to His Call. However, it may be worth mentioning the kind of things which continually need attention if an effective biblical ministry is to be maintained and an effective habit of Bible reading re-introduced into the ordinary habits of reasonably devout Anglicans.

First of all, of course, the parson himself must be a man of the Bible. He must keep up his studies so that he remains in touch with up-to-date theological thought and research. He cannot expect to provide a forty-year Ministry on three years' study at his Theological College.

More important, he must wrestle with the Bible day by day until he succeeds in drawing from it spiritual food and stimulus for himself,

some of which he will be able to pass on to his people. It is surprising what opportunities present themselves for the passing on of insights into biblical truth once the insights have been gained! In pastoral visitation there will often be opportunities for the reading or quoting of short passages from Scripture with a definite application to the personal situation in which parishioners find themselves. I suspect that the reading of the Bible in pastoral visitation is much less done than was once the case. Here is somewhere where we can all make new experiments for ourselves. Confirmation candidates can be trained in habits of personal Bible reading and there are excellent courses especially prepared by the Bible Reading Fellowship for this purpose. Steps can be taken to make the liturgical readings, the Gospel, Epistle, Psalms, and lessons tell more fully than they often do. New Translations of the Bible can be brought into service for this purpose. Although I personally am fully satisfied with the Authorized Version and find its rhythms like organ music to my ears, I must admit that where I have heard Lessons read from Versions like those of J. B. Phillips and Ronald Knox I have felt quite sure that the people were getting something that they do not usually get from our normal Lesson-reading. Corporate study of the Bible by groups of keen people can be used to build up a nucleus in a congregation which has some appetite for biblical knowledge and those ears have been sensitized to benefit from the public reading and exposition of Holy Scripture. Expository sermons can play a part but experience teaches me that it is not enough simply to resume expository sermons as though once they were delivered their effectiveness were assured. We have to do a great deal today to stimulate interest and if we try to provide material too far in advance of the stage which our hearers have reached we shall, in the end, do more harm than good.

I do not want any of these suggestions to be taken dogmatically or as though I thought they were final answers to our problem. If I have succeeded in stimulating thought and experiment along these lines I shall feel that I have done just a little to help forward the cause that we had in mind at Lambeth when we called on the Church for a new and special effort during this decade. It is humbling to think that nearly two years have gone by since Lambeth. If we are going to get far during the decade we shall have to move more quickly than we have so far.

Expository Preaching:

Charles Simeon and ourselves

BY JAMES PACKER

TWO preliminary points:

First, we must make clear to ourselves *what we mean when we speak of expository preaching*. This is necessary because the word "expository" is often used nowadays in a restricted sense to denote simply a sermon preached from a long text. Thus, Andrew Blackwood writes: "An expository sermon here means one that grows out of a Bible passage longer than two or three verses . . . an expository sermon means a textual treatment of a fairly long passage."¹ He goes on to suggest that young pastors should preach such sermons "perhaps once a month",² and to give hints on the problems of technique which they involve.

Without suggesting that Blackwood's usage is inadmissible for any purpose, I must dismiss it as too narrow for our present purpose—if only because it would exclude all but a handful of Charles Simeon's 2,536 published discourses from the category of "expository" sermons (his texts, you see, are too short!). We shall find it better to define "expository" preaching in terms, not of the length of the text, but of the preacher's approach to it, and to say something like this: Expository preaching is the preaching of the man who knows Holy Scripture to be the living word of the living God, and who desires only that it should be free to speak its own message to sinful men and women; who therefore preaches from a text, and in preaching labours, as the Puritans would say, to "open" it, or, in Simeon's phrase, to "bring out of the text what is there"; whose whole aim in preaching is to show his hearers what the text is saying to them about God and about themselves, and to lead them into what Barth called "the strange new world within the Bible" in order that there they may be met by Him Who is Lord of that world. The practice of expository preaching thus presupposes the Biblical and Evangelical account of the relation of the written words of Scripture to the speaking God with whom we have to do. Defining the concept in this way, we may say that every sermon which Simeon printed (and, no doubt, every sermon he ever preached) was an expository sermon; and, surely, we may add that every sermon which we ourselves preach should be an expository sermon. What other sort of sermons, we may ask, is there room for in Christ's Church?

Then, second, we must make clear to ourselves *why we are so interested in expository preaching at the present time*. Professor Blackwood had in view the American scene when he wrote: "Pastors everywhere are becoming concerned about expository preaching";³ but it is no less true of ourselves. And we do well to stop and ask ourselves: why is this? What lies behind this concern? Why are we all thinking and writing and talking about expository preaching these days? I

suspect that we are seeking something more than tips for handling long texts. It is at a deeper level that we want help. What troubles us, I think, is a sense that the old Evangelical tradition of powerful preaching—the tradition of Whitefield and Wesley and Berridge and Simeon and Haslam and Ryle—has petered out, and we do not know how to revive it. We feel that, for all our efforts, we as preachers are failing to speak adequately to men's needs. In other words, what lies behind our modern interest in expository preaching is a deep dissatisfaction with our own ministry. There is a delightful seventeenth-century tract by John Gereë entitled *The Character of an Old English Puritane*, in which we learn that such a man "esteemed that preaching best wherein was most of God, least of men."⁴ Our own constant suspicion, I think, is that our own preaching contains too much of man and not enough of God. We have an uneasy feeling that the hungry sheep who look up are not really being fed. It is not that we are not trying to break the bread of life to them; it is just that, despite ourselves, our sermons turn out dull and flat and trite and tedious and, in the event, not very nourishing. We are tempted (naturally) to soothe ourselves with the thought that the day of preaching is past, or that zealous visiting or organizing makes sufficient amends for ineffectiveness in the pulpit; but then we re-read 1 Cor. ii. 4—"my speech and my preaching was . . . in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"—and we are made uneasy again, and the conclusion is forced upon us once more that something is missing in our ministry. This, surely, is the real reason why we Evangelicals today are so fascinated by the subject of expository preaching: because we want to know how we can regain the lost authority and unction which made Evangelical preaching mighty in days past to humble sinners and built up the Church. When we ask: what is expository preaching? our question really means: how can we learn to preach God's Word "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power"? What is the secret of the preaching that achieves what our own sermons are failing to achieve?

* * * *

Suppose we could put the clock back a century and a half, and set our problem before Charles Simeon at one of his famous conversation parties—what would he say to us? The records suggest a number of things of which he would wish to remind us.

Being a supremely practical man, he would begin at the beginning, and say: *expository sermons are sermons*, and must therefore obey the ordinary formal rules of sermon construction. Otherwise, however good their matter, they will fail of their purpose.

"Simeon", wrote Canon Charles Smyth, "was almost the first man . . . to appreciate that it is perfectly possible to teach men how to preach, and to discover how to do so".⁵ In his edition of Claude's *Essay on the Composition of a sermon*, and in his weekly sermon parties, Simeon tirelessly hammered away at the basic lessons. A sermon is a single utterance; therefore it must have a single subject. Its divisions (which should be clearly marked, to help the listener follow and remember) should act like the joints of a telescope: "each successive division . . . should be as an additional lens to bring the

subject of your text nearer, and make it more distinct".⁶ In the interests of effective communication, all obscure and artificial forms of expression must be avoided. Of his own 2,536 skeletons, Simeon wrote : "The author has invariably proposed to himself three things as indispensably necessary in every discourse ; UNITY in the design, PERSPICUITY in the arrangement, and SIMPLICITY in the diction."⁷ Since a sermon is meant to instruct, it must not be above the congregation's heads ("do not preach what *you* can tell, but what your people can receive"⁸). Nor must it be too long, or their concentration will go, and "where weariness or exhaustion comes upon people, there is very little chance of your doing them more good on that occasion".⁹

A sermon, Simeon would further remind us, is as long as it seems, and an unnatural and monotonous way of talking in the pulpit can make it seem very long very quickly. Again, sermons are more than lectures, and have a further aim than the mere imparting of information. "The understanding must be informed, but in a manner . . . which *affects the heart* ; either to comfort the hearers, or to excite them to acts of piety, repentance, or holiness."¹⁰ Claude elsewhere lays it down that a sermon has a threefold aim—"to instruct, to please and to affect"¹¹ the introduction being designed chiefly to please, to win the hearers' interest and goodwill ; the exposition to instruct, to win their minds and judgments ; and the application to affect, to win, their hearts and wills. Don't cheapen your message, if you can help it, Simeon adds, either by cracking jokes in the pulpit ("a very painful style and manner"),¹² or by saying odd, fantastic things ("the pulpit is the seat of good, natural sense ; and the good sense of good men").¹³ "As to the mode of delivering your sermons, speak exactly as you would if you were conversing with an aged and pious superior. This will keep you from undue formality on the one hand, and from improper familiarity on the other."¹⁴ And so on, down to the best method of voice-production.¹⁵

Neglect these rules, Simeon would say, and your sermons will deservedly fail, however good your heart and your material, for communication will not be achieved. Moreover, he would add, there is no excuse for such failure ; for anyone can master the art of effective communication from the pulpit if he will only take the trouble. Daniel Wilson, in his memorial essay on Simeon, says the same. "Nor is anyone destitute of the means of engaging the attention of others, if he will but take pains early, and be persevering in his use of the natural means of acquiring the faculty of teaching with effect. Every man can be plain, and intelligible, and interesting when his own heart is engaged on other subjects, and why not in religion ?"¹⁶ Of course, it takes time—Wilson notes in the same paragraph that "few (of Simeon's sermons) cost him less than twelve hours of study—many twice that time". But who are we as clergy to grudge such an outlay ?

Such would be Simeon's first point to us.

Then he would go on to remind us that *expository sermons should be textual in character*. The preacher's task, according to him, was not imposition, giving texts meanings they do not bear ; nor was it juxtaposition, using texts merely as pegs on which to hang general reflections imported from elsewhere ("preachments of this kind are

extremely disgusting ");¹⁷ It was, precisely, ex-position, bringing out of the texts what God had put in them. "I never preach," said Simeon, "unless I feel satisfied that I have the mind of God as regards the sense of the passage."¹⁸ The motive behind his almost obsessive outbursts against Calvinistic and Arminian "system-Christians", as he called them, was his belief that, through reading Scripture in the light of their systems, both sides would be kept from doing justice to all the texts that were there. Whether or not we agree, we must at least endorse Simeon's "invariable rule . . . to endeavour to give to every portion of the word of God its full and proper force".¹⁹ Sermon-texts should be chosen with care, for the sermon should come out of the text whole and rounded, "like the kernel out of a hazel-nut; and not piecemeal . . . like the kernel out of a walnut".²⁰ Therefore, do not take a text that is too long to manage properly, and, on the other hand, "never choose such texts as have not a complete sense: for only impertinent and foolish people will attempt to preach from one or two words, which signify nothing".²¹ The text chosen should so shape the sermon "that no other text in the Bible will suit the discourse",²² and nothing foreign to the text must be allowed to intrude. For the prime secret of freedom and authority in preaching, as Simeon was well aware, is the knowledge that what you are saying is *exactly what your text says*, so that your words have a proper claim to be received as the Word of God.

* * * *

The next thing, I think, that Simeon would tell us is this: *expository sermons must have a doctrinal substructure.*

Let me explain, lest this be misunderstood. I do not mean that expository sermons should take the form of doctrine lectures, nor that they should be weighed down with theological technical terms not used in the text itself—the less of that, we may say, the better. The point is rather this: Doctrines are to Scripture as the sciences are to Nature. And as the scientist is to Nature, so should the expositor be to Scripture. The scientist, just because he has studied the laws which natural phenomena illustrate and embody, is able to explain these phenomena individually to the non-scientist, who observes them without understanding them. Similarly, the expositor who knows his doctrine (the truths and principles exhibited in the acts of God) is able to see the significance and implications of each particular text in a way that another man is not. And this is what he is called to do: to open up individual texts in the light of the *analogy of faith*, i.e., in terms of the broad framework of doctrinal truth which the Bible embodies.

Simeon did not have to stress this in his own lifetime, for it was everywhere taken for granted. As we saw, the characteristic error of Evangelicals then, both Calvinists and Arminians, was, to his mind, not neglect of the analogy of faith in their interpreting, but an over-rigid application of it. But he avowed the principle quite explicitly (in exposition "I have in mind the analogy of faith", he wrote),²³ and I think he would emphasize it strongly could he speak to us now. For his own sermons are doctrinal through and through, abounding in clear and exact (though often unobtrusive) formulations of the great foundation-truths of Scripture—God, creation, sin, the Trinitarian

plan of salvation, the atonement, the work of grace, the means of grace, the Church—and one suspects that by comparison he would find our would-be expository sermons distinctly foggy from a doctrinal standpoint.

One suspects too that, whereas he told the Evangelicals of his day that their handling of Scripture was cramped and lop-sided because of their undue preoccupation with doctrinal matters, he would tell us that ours was cramped and lop-sided because of our undue neglect of them; for, he would say, we have our few favourite subjects, which we can see in every text, but we leave great expanses of Biblical teaching untouched, as if we were unaware of their existence. The truth seems to be that part, at any rate, of the recipe for maintaining breadth and variety in one's regular exposition of particular texts is a thorough acquaintance with the doctrinal contents of the Bible as a whole; and no better proof of this could be given than the remarkable variety of theme and freshness and fulness of matter maintained throughout Simeon's own 2,536 printed sermons.

Next, Simeon would remind us that *expository sermons will have an evangelical content*. Always in some way they will set forth the gospel in its double aspect as a revelation and a remedy; always in some way they will throw light on the twin themes of sin and grace; for these are the things that the whole Bible is about. Always, therefore, their tendency will be threefold—"to humble the sinner; to exalt the Saviour; to promote holiness"²⁴—for that is the tendency of the Bible, and of every part of the Bible. Whatever part of the counsel of God they deal with, expository sermons will relate it to "Christ, and Him crucified", for the Christ of Calvary is, so to speak, the hub around which the whole Biblical revelation revolves. It was in this sense that Simeon, following Paul, insisted that "Christ, and Him crucified" was the whole of his message. And the preacher is not handling his texts biblically, Simeon would say, unless he is seeing and setting them in their proper relation to Christ. If the expositor finds himself out of sight of Calvary, that shows that he has lost his way. Again, Simeon's own sermons provide the best illustration of his principles here.²⁵

* * * *

The fifth point he would wish to make to us would, I think, be that *expository sermons must have a theocentric perspective*. The key that unlocks the biblical outlook is the perception that the real subject of Holy Scripture is not man and his religion, but God and His glory; from which it follows that God is the real subject of every text, and must therefore be the real subject of every expository sermon, as He is of Simeon's own sermons. This, again, is a point which Simeon could take for granted in his day, but on which he would need to expostulate with us; for we, to a greater extent, perhaps, than we realize, have inherited the later nineteenth century outlook which sets man at the centre of the stage, even in religion, and our thoughts and interests in the spiritual realm have become habitually and oppressively man-centred. What, really, do we preach about? *Man*—man and his religion, his needs, his problems and his responsibilities; for all the world as if man was the most important being in the universe, and the

Father and the Son existed simply for man's sake. This is an age of great thoughts of man and small, sentimental thoughts of God, within Evangelical Christendom hardly less than outside it. Simeon would tell us that we have things topsy-turvy; nor can we expect God to honour our preaching unless we honour Him by giving Him His rightful place in the centre of our message, and by reducing man to what he really is—a helpless, worthless rebel creature, saved only by a miracle of omnipotent holy love, and saved, not for his own sake, but for the praise of his Saviour. He would tell us that we can only expect great blessing on our preaching when our sole concern is to do what he himself was solely concerned to do—to magnify the great God Who works all things to His own glory, and to exalt His Son as a great Saviour of great sinners.

But what about the thing that most concerns us—this question of *power* in preaching? What would Simeon say to help us there? He would tell us that ultimately this was a matter of God's sovereign gift. "It is easy," he once said, "for a minister to prate in a pulpit, and even to speak much good matter; but to preach is not easy—to carry his congregation on his shoulders as it were to heaven; to weep over them, pray for them, deliver the truth with a weeping, praying heart; and if a minister has grace to do so now and then, he ought to be very thankful."²⁶ Meanwhile, he would say, we should seek to put ourselves in the way of such an endowment, first, by making it a matter of conscience to observe in all our sermon preparation the five principles set out above, and then by labouring constantly to be compassionate, sincere, and earnest in heart whenever we preach—men possessed by our message, saying what we say as if we meant it. How can we do this? By taking care deeply to digest the bread of life in our own hearts before we set it in the view of others. "Do not seek to preach what you do not feel," Simeon advises; "seek to feel deeply your own sins, and then you will preach earnestly . . . preach . . . as fellow-sinners."²⁷

Simeon himself is our example here. The feature of his preaching which most constantly impressed his hearers was the fact that he was, as they said, "in earnest"; and that reflected his own overwhelming sense of sin, and of the wonder of the grace that had saved him; and that in turn bore witness to the closeness of his daily fellowship and walk with his God. As he gave time to sermon preparation, so he gave time to seeking God's face. "The quality of his preaching," writes the Bishop of Bradford, "was but a reflection of the quality of the man himself. And there can be little doubt that the man himself was largely made in the early morning hours which he devoted to private prayer and the devotional study of the Scriptures. It was his custom to rise at 4 a.m., light his own fire, and then devote the first four hours of the day to communion with God. Such costly self-discipline made the preacher. That was primary. The making of the sermon was secondary and derivative."²⁸

That was primary. If our question is: where is the Lord God of Charles Simeon? we now have our answer. As so often with God's answers, it takes the form of a counter-question: where are the preachers who seek after the Lord God as Simeon did? This, surely,

is the final word, if not of Simeon, at least from God through Simeon, to us who would preach the gospel of Christ in the power of God's Spirit today. God help us to hear it, and to heed it.

¹ *The Preparation of Sermons*, p. 69.

² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁵ *The Art of Preaching*, p. 175.

⁶ A. W. Brown: *Recollections of the Conversation Parties of the Rev. Chas. Simeon*, p. 177.

⁷ *Horæ Homileticæ* (21 vols., 1832-3), I. vi (Preface).

⁸ Brown, p. 183.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

¹⁰ Claude's *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon with notes and illustrations* . . . (1866 edn.), p. 5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹² Brown, p. 376.

¹³ Claude, p. 5.

¹⁴ W. Carus: *Memoirs of . . . the Rev. Charles Simeon* (3rd edn., 1848) p. 483 f.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 481 ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 595.

¹⁷ Claude, p. 4.

¹⁸ Brown, p. 177.

¹⁹ *Horæ Homileticæ*, I. xxiii.

²⁰ Brown, p. 183.

²¹ Claude, p. 1.

²² Carus, p. 505.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 376.

²⁴ *Horæ Homileticæ*, I. xxi.

²⁵ See by all means the seventeen discourses by Simeon reproduced in *Let Wisdom Judge* (I.V.F., 1959).

²⁶ Brown, p. 105 f.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

²⁸ F. D. Coggan: *Stewards of Grace*, p. 32.

Some Theological Problems in relation to Religious Conversion

BY OWEN BRANDON

I SUBMIT this article as a prolegomenon to further inquiry, and therefore beg leave to raise questions without attempting adequately to answer them. Elsewhere I have recently suggested that more consideration should be given to certain aspects of evangelism and conversion in the light of present-day knowledge and needs. Therefore, when the Editor invited me to write an article on Conversion, I took the liberty to ask permission to raise these questions in the hope that they would call forth a response from others who might be able to contribute to their elucidation, and because I felt that *The Churchman* would be the ideal organ for their discussion.

* * * * *

The first question is, of course : *What do we mean by conversion?* During the last ten years a whole new body of literature has grown up on the subject of Conversion, and from a careful perusal of the literature it is evident that a variety of meanings are attached to the term. I personally have tested numerous individuals and groups of Christians, asking them to define conversion or to express what they understand by the term ; and have received replies ranging from such ideas as the first groping or turning of the soul toward God, to something like complete sanctification ! Canon F. W. B. Bullock in a recent work¹ has noted the same thing. Discussing the meaning of conversion, he says : " But ' religious conversion ', without any further definition or limitation, may mean many different things. In the broadest sense, it may mean some kind of a change, no matter of what nature, in a person's religious experience ; in the narrowest sense, it may mean a religious change of a particular kind, accomplished in a particular way by methods so stereotyped that an almost automatic result is secured ; or, of course, the phrase can mean anything between these two extremes." Incidentally, Dr. Bullock's is a definitive work, extremely well documented, and covering all the major literature of the subject. The serious student of the future will be grateful to Dr. Bullock for so much material within the compass of a single volume.

Now, until those who are engaged in evangelism are more agreed as to what conversion is, there is sure to be confusion, and confusion of a serious nature. When " converts " lapse and the question of the cause of their lapse is raised, usually one of a number of ingenious answers is given. Sometimes a distinction is made between psychological and spiritual conversion, and the lapsed are said to have been psychologically but not spiritually converted. Such an answer, however, shows a lack of psychological insight ; for if a person is truly psychologically converted, he would not easily lapse. In which case, who is to tell whether those converts who " stand " are psychologically or spiritually converted ? Sometimes the answer is given that

the lapsed were converted but not regenerated ; and in this case conversion is said to be the human act and regeneration the work of the Holy Spirit. But then we might ask on what ground this distinction is made. Why call for decisions if we cannot be certain that the Holy Spirit is moving in the hearts of our hearers ? And what becomes of the evangelist's confidence in his own oft-repeated text " All that the Father giveth me shall come to me ; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out " ?² If he should answer that the first part of the verse covers the contingency, then it might be argued that, by implication, that same part of the verse condemns his (the evangelist's) pressing for decisions. If the work of conversion is entirely God's, what right has the evangelist to press for decisions ? Another answer that is sometimes given is that the " convert " made a profession but was never converted. But, surely, that is just begging the question.

In recent campaigns, no doubt due largely to the influence of the Billy Graham crusades and of modern American pastoral language generally, those who come forward are referred to as " inquirers " rather than as " converts ", and they are " counselled " rather than " converted ". This is, no doubt, all to the good, but it does not help very much. The new language is, in reality, only a reflection of the problem ; it is not a solution. It only tends to emphasize the fact that the problem of definition is still acute, for there are many grades of " inquirers " and many forms of " counselling " are called for if their needs are really to be met.

Ultimately, this all boils down to the simple question : *Can we satisfactorily define religious conversion ?* I wonder whether we can, except in the broadest of terms. Go through the literature, or discuss the matter with individuals of differing ecclesiastical traditions, and note the number of different definitions or descriptions that are possible. In this connection I would recommend the reading of Dr. Erik Routley's book *The Gift of Conversion*³. He shows how that there has grown up a " mythology of conversion ", a hypothetical pattern of events in the religious life, built (so it is thought) on the well-known and authentic stories " which everybody knows either by acquaintance with the sources or by hearsay ". Pre-eminent among these are the experiences of St. Paul, St. Augustine, and John Wesley. Dr. Routley says : " There is a widespread tendency in those who seek conversion and in those who have achieved it to assimilate their desire or their experience to the archetypes, or to their understanding of them. This is where, not infrequently, mischief has been done. It is not unknown for preachers to preach towards a conversion conceived on the pattern popularly ascribed to the conversions of Paul, Augustine, or Wesley, nor is it uncommon for seekers to expect conversion on that pattern. The pattern thus offered or sought need not be—normally is not—the historic pattern which those conversions actually followed : it is rather the pattern ascribed to them by traditional belief."⁴ And he goes on to say : " We must now lay stress on the fact that each of these three classic conversions is *sui generis* and not at any point to be subsumed under any categories that will do for either of its neighbours. All they have in common is that they are a turning to the Christian

Way. But in all other matters they differ *toto caelo*. Paul turns from persecuting the Way. Augustine turns from insulting it. Wesley turns from following it blindfold. Paul is a man of learning; Augustine a cultivated man of licence; Wesley a man of piety. Paul, converted, becomes an apostle; Augustine, converted, becomes a bishop and man of letters (in some respects, not the best of bishops); Wesley, converted, becomes a missionary to his home country. You cannot even use the three great stories to clericalize conversion; only Augustine of the three becomes anything essentially like a professional minister of the Gospel."⁵ It seems evident that conversion means different things to different people in different circumstances and in different states of need, and that a broader understanding of the subject is necessary in the face of modern needs.

* * * *

Our next question is: *What is the Gospel?* The situation in Manchester over next year's proposed Billy Graham crusade^a should give Christian leaders food for serious thought. It raises the question: What is the Gospel? When the Committee of the Manchester and Salford Council of Churches was asked whether it would consider issuing the invitation to Dr. Graham, as a body representing wide Christian interests in the city, the Committee decided that it could do so only on condition that Dr. Graham be asked to share the main ministry of the campaign with men the Committee would like to nominate, the names of Dr. Donald Soper, Father Trevor Huddleston, and Dr. George Macleod being specifically mentioned. It was thought that such men would balance the ministry of the crusade by showing the relevance of the Gospel to the contemporary social situation. The spokesmen for Dr. Graham, however, replied that, although they realized the need for such an emphasis and recognized the competence of the Christian leaders named, they felt, nevertheless, that they ought not to depart from their principle and practice of having Dr. Graham as the sole preacher at the main rally meetings.

Now, quite apart from other considerations—and there probably are others—we have here a clash of opinions as to what the Gospel really is. The Committee of the Council of Churches obviously felt that the message of the campaign ought to be directed to the total life of men; Dr. Graham's representatives felt that Christianity has something to say to man's total life but that that is not the Gospel. A crucial question, therefore, arises. Put into theological terms, we may ask: What are the doctrines involved in the message of evangelism? The simplest answer, I suppose, is that the evangelistic message concerns man's sin and God's work of redemption: it involves the doctrines of Man, Sin, and Grace. That sounds simple enough, but is it adequate? The moment we introduced the concept of *sin* we are faced, in this modern age, with the whole problem of morality; and this is something which we just cannot escape. Now it seems to me that we need to adopt a two-fold attitude to this problem of morality (and I am thinking here, not only in terms of evangelism, but also in the wider setting of Christian duty): (1) We must take cognizance of all that modern psychology tells us about guilt-consciousness. There are "sinners" who need to be treated as sick persons; but

(2) we must not allow science to have the last word in the matter of moral judgments. There is in our modern world a very real and important place for Ethics. I think that Dr. J. A. Hadfield's distinction between Sin and Moral Disease⁷ is relevant here, and that there is, as he says, a place for the concept of sin in psychology.

But, having said this at (2), I think that the statement needs to be qualified, or, at least, clarified. The New Testament and common experience would seem to show that there are at least three aspects of sin : (i) Godward ; (ii) Manward ; (iii) Selfward. We might distinguish them by the terms theological social, and psychological. And we might well ask : Are not all these aspects of sin equally important ? And is not man equally in need of reconciliation at all these three levels ? Theologians have tended to think, perhaps, mainly, though not exclusively, of the Godward aspect ; sociologists of the manward aspect ; and psychologists of the personal or selfward aspect. But modern man needs to learn the way of reconciliation in all aspects of his need ; and it seems reasonable to suggest that this cannot be done either by parsons or by sociologists or by psychologists working in isolation in a restricted area of man's total experience of life. What we need is a much wider and much fuller view of man and his needs ; and this, I think, might bring us back to a more Biblical view of man. And preaching based on such a view, expressed in terms which modern man can understand, would give the impression of being more scientific, more relevant, and more practical than the preaching of so many, both in the past and at the present time, which appears to be based on a deficient theology because lacking in sociological and psychological perspectives. Theology, sociology, and psychology are not three separate, isolated disciplines applicable to three different groups of professional practitioners ; surely, today we must see them as three aspects of one great body of knowledge available to pastors and to educators, to sociologists and to psychologists, and, indeed, to all who are engaged in the service of modern man.

Now, if this is true, or if it approximates in any degree to truth, then it has an inevitable bearing on evangelism ; and the question it raises is : Does the evangelist who preaches only (or mainly) the Godward aspect of sin *lose* something by his neglect (or partial neglect) of its sociological and psychological implications ; or does he *gain* something by simplifying the matter in calling the individual to repentance ? My feeling is that the loss is greater than the gain. To quote a saying of Canon Guy King years ago (though, admittedly out of its context, for Canon King was speaking in another connection) : Can a man adequately answer the question, " Where art thou ? " (Gen. iii. 9) without facing the challenge of the question, " Where is thy brother ? " (Gen. iv. 9) ?

We might almost ask : What is the purpose of modern evangelism ? But this question has been adequately discussed by Douglas Webster in his book, *What is Evangelism* ?⁸ and by Alan Walker in *The Whole Gospel for the Whole World*.⁹ All one can do here is to ask the question : Can modern man possibly understand the doctrines of Sin and Grace if he is not also shown the Godward, manward, and selfward aspects of his own fundamental need ?

* * * *

A question which has cropped up several times recently is : *Can there be any true conversion without a prior conviction of sin?* Renewed interest in recent years in the great religious revivals of the past has helped to underline the question. It is sometimes said that the greatest need of our age is a real conviction of sin, that in the past men, women, and children were brought under deep conviction of sin when the Gospel was preached, and that until our generation experiences such conviction we shall not see true revival.

Now, of course, it is true that deep conviction of sin was experienced by multitudes in the 17th and 18th century revivals, but that was because their minds had been conditioned to feel such conviction by generations of preachers. It was the noticing of this fact that led Dr William Sargant to study the subject of conversion and which led to his (to many people) devastating book, *Battle for the Mind*.¹⁰ But let us illustrate the matter, first by reference to hymns, for so often hymns influence the mind of the worshipper in ways he little realizes, and then by direct reference to the literature of revival.

In one of his books, Dr. G. A. Coe¹¹ quotes a hymn from a collection of "Hymns for Sunday Schools, Youth and Children" published in 1852, which runs :

- " There is beyond the sky
A heaven of joy and love :
And holy children, when they die,
Go to that world above.
- " There is a dreadful hell,
And everlasting pains ;
There sinners must with devils dwell,
In darkness, fire, and chains.
- " Can such a child as I
Escape this awful end ?
And may I hope, whene'er I die,
I shall to heaven ascend ?
- " Then will I read and pray,
While I have life and breath ;
Lest I should be cut off today,
And sent t' eternal death."

Dr. Coe was, of course, writing about America. How far this particular collection of hymns was used in American Sunday Schools one is unable to say ; but if this hymn is in any way typical of the hymns used with children at that time, no wonder they felt intense guilt-consciousness. Some of the hymns used in English Sunday Schools about that time, and even up to recent times in some Sunday Schools in England are not very different. H. A. L. Jefferson,¹² writing on this point, remarks that when modern English hymn books are compared with those in use half a century ago, the most striking changes are those in the section devoted to children's hymns. He says : " When we look at the older hymnals it is well nigh beyond belief that some of

the sentiments and dogmas expressed could have been imposed on children." And then he quotes a children's hymn from Isaac Watts, beginning :

"What if the Lord grow wroth, and swear,
While I refuse to read and pray,
That He'll refuse to lend an ear
To all my groans another day?"

and ending with :

"'Tis dangerous to provoke a God !
His power and vengeance none can tell :
One stroke of His almighty rod
Shall send young sinners quick to hell."

Perhaps these are extreme examples, indeed, it is to be hoped that they are. Certainly, I quote them as extreme. Nevertheless, it remains true, even to this day, that the main emphasis in many of our most popular hymns is on the twin themes of sin and redemption. This became evident in a questionnaire which I circulated amongst representative bodies of Christian folk.

That there was a strong emphasis on sin and judgment as a preliminary to the offering of the Gospel, both in America and on this side of the Atlantic, during the great periods of revival, is a matter of history, and is a commonplace to anyone who is familiar with the literature of the times ; but, to make the point even more strongly, I venture to quote further. This time from the great evangelist, Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875). On the need for self-examination and confession of sin, he wrote : "Self-examination consists in looking at your lives, in considering your actions, in calling up the past, and learning its true character. Look back over your past history. Take up your individual sins one by one, and look at them. I do not mean that you should just cast a glance at your past life, and see that it has been full of sins, and then go to God and make a sort of general confession, and ask for pardon. That is not the way. You must take them one by one. It will be a good thing to take pen and paper, as you go over them, and write them down as they occur to you. Go over them as carefully as a merchant goes over his books ; and as often as a sin comes before your memory, add it to the list. General confessions will never do. Your sins were committed *one by one* ; and as far as you can come at them, they ought to be reviewed and repented of one by one. Now begin, and take up first what are commonly, but *improperly*, called Sins of Omission."¹³

Sargent¹⁴ quotes from the same source. He says : "Finney insisted that the revivalist should never relax the mental pressure on a prospective convert", and then quotes from Finney's *Lectures on Revival*, thus : "One of the ways in which people give false comfort to distressed sinners is by asking them : 'What have you done? You are not so bad. . . .' When the truth is, they have been a great deal worse than they think they have. No sinner ever had an idea that his sins were greater than they are. No sinner ever had an adequate idea of how great a sinner he is. It is not probable that any man could live under the full sight of his sins. God has, in mercy, spared all his

creatures on earth that worst of sights, a naked human heart. The sinner's guilt is much more deep and damning than he thinks, and his danger is much greater than he thinks it is ; and if he could see them as they are probably he would not live one moment."

Sargant comments : " Once the sense of guilt has been implanted, Finney knew that, to clinch the matter, no concessions of any sort could be made."

Another passage from Finney, quoted by Sargant, is relevant to our discussion. Finney declared : " Protracted seasons of conviction are generally owing to defective instruction. Wherever clear and faithful instructions are given to sinners, there you will generally find the convictions are *deep* and *pungent*, but short. . . . Where sinners are deceived by false views, they may be kept along for weeks, and perhaps months, and sometimes years, in a languishing state, and at last, perhaps, be crowded into the kingdom and saved. But where the truth is made perfectly clear to the sinner's mind, if he does not soon submit, his case is hopeless."

Finney saw the importance of the conditioning process. He had no illusions about it. Indeed, his whole thesis is that where revival is sedulously prepared for, it will surely come. And these are not isolated quotations. They could be reduplicated from writers on both sides of the Atlantic. They reflect a widespread mental outlook throughout Evangelical Christendom at that time. No wonder the feeling of conviction of sin was common amongst those who came under the ministry of these great preachers.

James Burns, in his treatise on Revival,¹⁵ states that " every revival movement seeks an awakening in the individual and in the Church of a deep sense of sin ". And he adds : " In the intense spiritual light, the sin and guilt of the awakened soul stand out in terrifying blackness. Not only are the cardinal sins laid bare in all their hideousness, but the convicted see themselves as in a mirror ; they see themselves as God sees them ; every fault, every meanness, every deviation from the truth, every act of self-interest, of betrayal, of hypocrisy, confronts them ; their sins drag them to judgment ; they cry out in their despair ; an awful terror seizes them ; under the pressure of the Spirit they often fall to the ground with loud cries and tears, the conviction of sin burns them like fire. Yet this ' terror of the Lord ', remarkable though it may seem, is not the terror of punishment ; it is inspired by a sense of having rebelled against the divine love, of having failed to give glory to God, of having crucified Christ afresh. This is the sin which, above all others, gives to the awakened soul at such times its most poignant bitterness. Under the pressure of this agony of conviction, men openly confess their sins. They go through the long and terrible catalogue, hiding nothing ; their one intense longing is to cast their sins for ever from them, and to be brought into reconciliation and be at peace with God."

My own studies have shown that those who are nurtured in an evangelical atmosphere and/or who come under the influence of evangelical preaching and teaching, often do experience a conviction of sin even today. But the question I would raise here is : Is this conviction of sin essential to real conversion ? Or is it the concomitant of a

certain kind of teaching? Whatever answer we give to these questions, those who long for a return to the days when men, women, and children sought God in an agony of conviction, must not forget that that response was called forth from the hearers by an element of exposition that has been lacking in Christian preaching in recent years. Can we expect that response without the long process of conditioning? Do we need to stir up that response? Is it a necessary part of real conversion? Or is another response-pattern adequate and more appropriate for today?

* * * *

Another question, closely related to the one just mentioned, is that concerning *the inducement of fear*. Fear is often a concomitant of conversion. Both in the history of revivals and in the experience of individuals, fear is sometimes associated with guilt consciousness, and sometimes with an anxiety state arising from social unrest and/or uncertainty. I give but one example:

The Revival in Kilsyth, in Scotland, in the early part of last century, gave rise to a volume of *Lectures on Revival*¹⁶ by a group of Ministers of the Church of Scotland, published in 1840. In the Preface the authors define a revival of religion as "an unusual manifestation of the power of the grace of God in convincing and converting careless sinners, and in quickening and increasing the faith and piety of believers". And this manifestation is seen against the background of social unrest and widespread fear. They say: "Still there is one topic to which we must, however, briefly advert. The state and aspect of the times, fraught with the elements of peril and commotion, give a feeling of importance to the subject of revivals of religion which it might otherwise not have been thought to possess. The *reality* of the importance indeed cannot be increased, but men's *perception* of it may; and the condition of our country, and of the world, is such, that all men anticipate a period near at hand, marked by mighty events, and productive of changes of incalculable potency for evil or for good. Never, probably, were such mighty agencies at once in such a state of restless and conflicting action. It seems as if some universal convulsion were on the point of bursting forth, to wrench and shake asunder the entire fabric of society throughout the world, and to cast the shattered fragments into the boiling vortex of confusion, that they may be utterly broken to pieces, fused, and blended together, preparatory to the formation of a completely new order of things out of the dissevered and chaotic ruins. No principles or laws, civil or political, seem to have any power to avert the dire convulsion. All who think deeply on the subject are alike persuaded, that none but an Almighty hand can check the progress of the demoralizing and dissociating principles which are at present working with such fearful energy in the very heart of the community. In the midst of these portentous omens, nothing could reassure and calm our minds but the cheering hope, the heart-confirming belief, that God had not utterly forsaken us. And nothing could have given us this assurance of hope, but some unusual manifestation of His gracious presence, such as He has been pleased to grant by 'reviving His work in the midst of the years, and in wrath remembering mercy'."

I quote this in full, for it is so much like the kind of preaching one hears so often today. In fact, I gave this quotation, in typescript, to a friend of mine to read, and he thought it to be a diagnosis of the contemporary situation by a present-day preacher! Its date, of course, is 1840.

It is all too easy to engender fear in some minds. Today we seldom, if ever, hear the terrors of hell preached in evangelism, though we do hear of souls "going to a lost (or to a Christless) eternity". What we hear more about today are the perils that await civilization, and the threat of nuclear war. These are the terrors which some evangelists use today as the background against which to proclaim the Gospel; and the question must surely be raised: Is it necessary, or right, that this should be the case? Sometimes the appeal to fear on the part of the evangelist leads individuals to seek the comforts, security, and consolations of religion; but sometimes it has the opposite effect, and creates feelings of repulsion. A few years ago an old lady who lived alone went to an evangelistic service where the film "God and the Atom" was being shown. It frightened her. She came away perplexed, and said to her vicar afterwards, "I didn't realize that our God could be so cruel as to create such things." Poor old soul! Perhaps she was wiser than the enthusiastic young evangelist who used the terrors of the atom to appeal for conversions. Anyway, in her case the appeal misfired. And I could quote examples of other persons who have been turned away from religion by this kind of approach. My questions here are: Is the evangelist right in making an appeal to fear as a basis for Gospel preaching? And: Is it ever right to induce fear, or to attempt to induce fear, in order to produce conversion?

* * * *

Here, then, are the questions. I apologize for the personal note that has been introduced so frequently into this article; but these matters are my great concern at the moment, and I seek the help of others in arriving at satisfactory answers to the questions raised. It will be both helpful and gratifying to learn the views of others who have something to contribute to the discussion.

¹ *Evangelical Conversion in Great Britain, 1696-1845*, by F. W. B. Bullock 1960.

² John vi. 37.

³ *The Gift of Conversion*, by Erik Routley, 1957.

⁴ *The Gift of Conversion*, p. 16.

⁵ *The Gift of Conversion*, p. 26.

⁶ As reported in *The Church of England Newspaper*, April 8, 1960.

⁷ *Psychology and Morals*, by J. A. Hadfield, 13th editn., 1944.

⁸ *What is Evangelism?* by Douglas Webster, 1959.

⁹ *The Whole Gospel for the Whole World*, by Alan Walker, 1958.

¹⁰ *Battle for the Mind*, by William Sargant, 1957.

¹¹ *Education in Religion and Morals*, by George A. Coe, 1904.

¹² *Hymns in Christian Worship*, by H. A. L. Jefferson, 1950.

¹³ *Finney on Revivals: Selected Lectures*, by William Henry Harding, Revised Edition, p. 52.

¹⁴ *Battle for the Mind*, pp. 142-143.

¹⁵ *Revivals, the Laws and their Leaders*, by James Burns, 1909, pp. 20-21.

¹⁶ *Lectures on the Revival of Religion*, by Ministers of the Church of Scotland, 1840.

The Divine and Human Elements in Conversion

BY MAURICE WOOD

WITHIN the narrow limits of our space, I want to outline a preliminary study of the Biblical view of the special gifts of the evangelist, what is his relation to the total ministry of the whole church, what are his practical and spiritual limitations, and those duties which God has specially committed to him, by virtue of the evangelistic gifts entrusted to him. I shall illustrate this by a brief glance at the work of Philip, one of the early evangelists in the apostolic age, to help us find our own duty in this task of evangelism which in some measure is laid upon every Christian, by virtue of his membership within the Church which is the Body of Christ.

In the New Testament, an evangelist is a distinct and recognizable part of the total ministry of the Church, either clerical or lay, and it is in this context of the whole ministry that St. Paul speaks of evangelists in Ephesians.

His gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the equipment of the saints, for (or towards) the work of the ministry. Eph. iv. 11, 12 (R.S.V.).

We notice three things in the context of this passage, which throw light on the evangelist:

(1) Eph. iv. 3-6 lays reiterated emphasis upon the unity of the God-head, and so the related unities within the Deity, set out here in almost a credal manner.

It is unlike our classical Creeds [says R. R. Williams, Bishop of Leicester, in *Studies in Ephesians: the Lectures of the Third Theology and Ministry Convention, Christ Church, Oxford*] because it mentions the great affirmations of the faith in almost exactly the reverse order in which they occur in, e.g., the Nicene Creed. That Creed uses what I have called the order of logic or metaphysics, i.e., it begins with God the Father, the Creator, proceeds to God the Son, and ends with the Holy Spirit and the Church. The Ephesians passage begins with the experimental fact of the Church ("there is one body"), goes on to the mention of the One Spirit, proceeds to the person of the One Lord (to which is attached suitably enough "one faith, one baptism") and ends with the fact of One God ("One God and Father of all"). This is the evangelistic order.

Here is the experience into which the evangelist will, by the same Spirit, lead his hearers, but here also is the deep unity of God's plan, purpose, and Person, in which the evangelist finds his small but vital and inter-locking part.

(2) Eph. iv. 7-11 tells us that grace is given to each of us according to the measure of Christ's gift, for "He gave gifts to men" (Study the suggestive exegesis of Psalm lxxviii, "the greatest, most splendid and artistic of the temple songs of Restored Jerusalem" (Ewald), in that old book of G. G. Findlay in the Expositors' Bible Series (p. 229, New Edition).

Here is unity in diversity. God is "ONE God and Father of us all", "above all and through all and in all", and yet stoops to impart differing gifts by grace to different human instruments. The gifts of the evangelist are as important, no less and no more, than the other charismatic gifts of the pastor and teacher.

(3) Eph. iv. 12 reminds us that all these gifts are not to be husbanded for their own sakes, but are God's gifts through men "for the equipment of the saints to do the work of ministry". The whole church needs the evangelist, as well as the pastor and the teacher.

* * * *

There is an historical as well as an experimental sequence in this list of differing ministries.

The apostles in the first century were "from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word" (Luke i. 2, R.S.V.) They proclaimed the historic facts of Bethlehem, Galilee, the Mount of Transfiguration, the Hill of the Skull, the Garden Tomb, and the Mount called Olivet, and the human figure of Jesus, who left His indelible and Divine work on each historic site.

Then came *the prophets*; the prophets of the Old Covenant came into their own, when the disciples, illuminated by the same Spirit that had inspired the Old Testament writers, saw, with Dominical authority, "Christ in all the Scriptures" (Luke xxiv. 27) and so became the prophets of the New Covenant.

The historic Jesus, seen to be the suffering servant of Jehovah and the Messiah of the prophets, is now preached by *the evangelists* as the message which demands a verdict, and, pricked to the heart by the emotional, moral, and intellectual challenge of Peter, men cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts ii. 37). One fears that Sargant would hardly have approved! (*The Battle of the Mind*, by William Sargant).

Three thousand people were gloriously and suddenly converted, and *the pastors* and *the teachers* were pitchforked into action, but the evangelistic nets held firm, because the pastoral crooks were ready, so that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship" (Acts ii. 42).

In the first days of the early church, the historic order was apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. That this historic sequence is also the pattern for church life and development in every age is brought out well in Ruth Paxon's book *The wealth, walk, and warfare of the Christian*.

The foundation of the Church must be securely laid in the Lord Jesus Christ and made known in an authoritative body of teaching. This divinely attested truth must be thoroughly

taught to the Church. So Christ gave to the Church in its infancy some to be apostles and prophets. Upon this foundation, laid once for all, a building was to be constructed for a habitation of God made up of living stones, to be added one by one. A mystical Body was to be created for Christ, the Head, out of sinners saved by grace and quickened by His Spirit. This required evangelists who would go far and wide to proclaim the gospel and extend the boundaries of the Church through winning souls one by one and "adding to the Church such as should be saved". But the sheep must be shepherded, so there was the need of pastors; the members of the Body must be built up in their knowledge of Christ through the Word, so there was need of teachers. As the evangelist labours to extend the Church, so the pastor and the teacher work to edify it.

"*For the perfecting of the saints.*" The special gifts are bestowed with a definite, divine design. No gift is bestowed for the sake of the man himself. It is given to one for the sake of the whole. Neither does it place the monopoly of service in the hands of a gifted few. The evangelist, pastor, and teacher are not commissioned by the Lord to do all the work of the Church but rather to so feed, teach, and train the saints individually that each of them be brought to spiritual maturity and thoroughly equipped to fill his place and do his work in building up the Whole Body. Every Christian has been made a king and a priest unto God (Rev. i. 6). As the whole Body is bound together in faith and in life, so is it also united in service.

But what discord we see in the Church today caused by these very gifts! What unholy ambition! What sinful pride! What corroding jealousy! What spiteful envy!

In Ephesians, God has shown us what is our responsibility in this matter of keeping this God-ordained and God-designed unity of the Spirit in the Body of Christ. We should have a fixed determination that we shall not allow anything for which we are to blame to separate us even a hair's-breadth from any other member of the Body. We should study diligently how to keep this unity; and make it our personal business to advocate it whenever possible. We should determine to stand together on the basis of truth and in the bond of love as an act of allegiance and devotion to Him who is our one Lord, and thus glorify Him by walking in unity (pp. 102, 103).

True and humiliating words! We do well to ponder this passage. I have quoted at length, because we are not always united in Christ, for whichever gift God has given to us is to be used for the whole Church and that means that we must in our turn depend upon others who are gifted with complementary spiritual gifts. The evangelist needs the pastor, if his converts are to be brought into fellowship, and so prepared to listen to the teacher. The pastor needs the teacher if his lambs are to grow strong and knowledgeable and "able to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2). The teacher needs the evangelist, or he will be out of a job, with nobody to teach!

This is 20th Century commonsense, and 1st Century scriptural teaching, but to our shame it is not always a mark of our Church life today. The evangelist can be impatient of the parochial caution and the unrelated pedantry of the teacher. The parish pastor can be suspicious of the "methods" of the itinerant evangelist, and jealous of the cloistered calm of the scholarly teacher. The teacher can be supercilious of the simplicity and denigratory of the appeal of the evangelist, and be ignorant of the sorrows (and joys) of the pastor.

We must elevate the importance of this threefold function of ministry; and seek to draw all three together, and each be "eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace". (Eph. iv. 3).

The evangelist's work must be seen as a spirit-given ability, integrated into God's pattern for the ministry of Christ's Church, and necessary for the life of the Church as a whole, if all the saints are to be perfected, and brought into the fruitful, reproductive, witnessing, and evangelistic ministry, suggested by the idea of the priesthood of all believers.

Unfortunately, the biblical view of the specialized, Spirit-equipped work of an evangelist within the normal pattern of church life, is often obscured today, to the detriment of the Gospel and the loss of precious souls for whom Christ died.

* * * *

In the brief scope of this paper, however, we must confine ourselves to one biblical evangelist, namely Philip the deacon (not to be confused with Philip the Apostle) who, after his leader Stephen's martyrdom, came to the fore as "*Philip the evangelist*, which was one of the seven" (Acts xxi. 8).

The evangelist has a limited message. "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and *preached Christ* unto them" (Acts viii. 5).

The evangelist is to preach Christ to the unconverted. Dr. Billy Graham, and most other evangelists are criticized on two grounds, in this respect. The narrow sacramentalist, or the man with limited views on conversion and a general satisfaction with the outward forms of church-going, criticizes the evangelist for not reaching beyond the fringe of the occasional church-goer, and is sometimes distressed because he receives, by way of commendation from an evangelistic mission, the name of some young person who has recently been confirmed, or baptized in believer's baptism, or otherwise received into their denominational full membership.

Here is encouragement as well as rebuke. The youngster has already received "apostolic" testimony and "prophetic" truth in his local church, so that he has begun to see his need, to understand the provision of Christ, and to recognize the challenge of response. Then, in the order of Ephesians iv. 11, noted above, he hears the evangelist "*preaching Christ*", and the Holy Spirit convicts him of his sin of *not believing on Christ* (see the important references of John xvi. 7-9, and John iii. 18.) The Holy Spirit then shows him that repentance and faith are the steps Jesus Himself demanded (Mark i. 15), which St. Peter (Acts ii. 38) and St. Paul (Acts xx. 21) everywhere reiterated,

both to Jews and Gentiles, and with which the evangelist today now confronts him for a verdict.

Church membership is not enough. Christ must be personally trusted for salvation. This, at least, is the clear teaching of the Church of England, which paradoxically but biblically states that we are not saved only by belonging to the Church of England.

"They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set unto us only the Name of Jesus, whereby men must be saved." (Article XVIII. Of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.)

The Lord God is Sovereign, and in His wisdom sometimes *does* lead "dying thieves" to Jesus, with no previous knowledge of the faith, just as soon as Christ is preached, but it is the experience of most evangelists that those who profess conversion usually have some previous Christian knowledge, or at least have been under conviction of sin. Even the sudden and dramatic conversion of St. Paul was prefaced by the "ox-goads" (Acts ix. 5). My good friend, Mr. Tom Rees, once told me that he found that nearly all converts told him, if questioned some months after their conversion, that they had now discovered that someone had been praying for them, before they came to the point of decision.

Although the evangelist will teach, in the course of his preaching so that his message is addressed to the whole personality, made up of intellect, conscience, emotions, and will, his main message will be limited in general to those themes of the Gospel that centre in the person and work of Christ, crucified, risen, and alive for evermore for he *must* rely upon the faithful work of preparation by other Christians through prayer, witness, and systematic Bible teaching, and on the Holy Spirit's work of enlightenment and conviction.

Not only will his message be limited in its scope, but limited in its application, also, and this produces a second criticism. Dr. Bill Graham was criticized in this country, and also in Scotland by such leaders as Dr. George Macleod, because his message was said to be only personal, and was not addressed to the social problems of the day. But "unto everyone of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. iv. 7).

The task of preaching the Gospel is exceedingly difficult, if we are to do it with "truth, clarity, and passion" (Dr. Campbell Morgan) by putting into clear and arresting and balanced words the eternal verities; by making a warm, personal contact with a constantly changing audience; and by shepherding individual sinners in difficult culties of soul to the foot of Christ's Cross.

It is *so* difficult, that it would seem that God has not given to man the ability both to evangelize, and *also* to relate the faith to the problems of race relations, nuclear disarmament, under-developed countries, inter-church relations, missionary strategy, liturgical experiments, church reunion schemes, contraception, education

road-safety, industrial peace, refugees, and mental health, to name but a few of the fields in which Christian scholars are seeking to relate the unchanging Gospel to the changing needs of our exciting day and age.

In each of these fields, however, experts become so absorbed in their own work, that if the evangelist does not relate his evangelistic addresses to their particular interest, they feel his message is lacking.

As an example, I was interested to hear Bishop Ted Wickham give this as one of his reasons for not supporting Dr. Billy Graham. It is an easy criticism, but a glance at even the short list of subjects in the previous paragraph soon shows that it is not a valid one, once we accept the evangelist's ministry as only part of the total ministry of the church, and recognize that the Army's principle of "the maintenance of the objective" is vital to his success.

In practice, the mobility of the evangelist leads him to become well-informed enough on many social problems, so that he is able to put the essential challenge of conversion and committal to Christ in a way that will often be closely related to the needs of men under certain social pressures. It is worth noting that after his recent evangelistic tour of Africa, Dr. Billy Graham was invited to the White House to discuss Race Relations with the President of the United States and his advisers, but his first duty, clearly given him by God, still remains paramount. Very few of us are large enough to bear the weight in our souls of more than one major burden from God. The evangelist must always say, "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 16).

At the same time, every good evangelist will challenge his converts with the resultant duty of witness for Christ, and so by the grace of God new men will be injected into many of their old situations where they will now bring Christian insight to bear on the social structure of their milieu, and, having been found by Christ, will seek to make Him known amongst their contemporaries at work and at home.

The evangelist cannot be accused of preaching the Gospel in isolation, and without what Bishop Ted Wickham calls "involvement", because as long as he proclaims the personal Gospel *fully*, the Holy Spirit will show the converts the need of applying their new found faith in their individual environment, given the one condition of good "follow-up" through the local minister, who must then exercise a truly pastoral and teaching ministry.

* * * *

The evangelist has a limited stay. More briefly, we learn from the agricultural world, in a simile which has Dominical authority, that though ploughing and sowing and weeding and watering take a *long* time, the harvest is a *short* time. Philip the evangelist went through "many villages" (Acts viii. 25) of that part of Samaria where the Master Himself had first said, "Herein is that saying true 'One soweth, and another reapeth'. I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labour: other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours" (John iv. 37, 38).

The evangelist, be he a visiting "Guest Service" preacher, a ten day missionary in a parish church, or the leader of a large student or united church mission, has a right to expect that by apostolic preaching and testimony, by prophetic exposition of the Word, by believing prayer that brings Holy Ghost conviction, together with sacrificial actions by Christians which bring in the uncommitted, he stands for his limited stay on *prepared* ground. If not, the local Christians, and not his methods, must bear the major criticism.

Against the background of all we have already written, however, he comes to *preach for a verdict*.

Of that grand old Puritan Richard Baxter, it was said, he

"Preached as never sure to preach again
And as a dying man to dying men."

See this and other important quotations on these themes in Chapter VII, *Hallmarks of Preaching*, in *The Ministry of the Word* by the present Bishop of Bradford, Dr. F. D. Coggan.

"Preaching for a verdict" has always been one of the assumptions which Evangelicals have shared in unity, for it has been a hallmark of evangelical evangelism.

The evangelist has a limited duty. Despite the fact that he must wholly rely upon God the Holy Spirit to do the work of regeneration, to the evangelist is surely and biblically committed the limited duty of presenting Christ as Saviour and Lord, demonstrating the biblical steps of repentance and faith, and offering personal help to the puzzled seeker, and pointing the way to first steps in Christian living, so that having accepted Christ as Saviour, the convert may grow up in the fellowship of the Church.

Let us return to our biblical evangelist in Acts viii. Philip obeyed the Holy Spirit and "joined himself", at some personal embarrassment, to the lonely Ethiopian (verse 20). Finding him reading the great "Servant" passages of Isaiah, he asked him if he understood the Bible, and he received the charter of all personal workers, counsellors, and "Instruction Talk" speakers! "'How can I, except some man should guide me?' And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him" (verses 30, 31).

It is indeed for God, not man, to fix the time of conversion, but it is for man to be humbly and obediently in the hand of God to help the seeker *to the uttermost*. It is surely illogical to believe that God can take our poor lips to preach publicly the unsearchable riches of Christ, but does not also desire, as with Philip, to answer the personal questions of the seeker by privately "preaching unto him Jesus", from the opened Bible (verse 35), as any modern counsellor does; to point out the steps to simple committal to Christ (verse 37a) and to have the joy of calling out the witness of the lips to the reality of the heart's trust in the Saviour (verse 37b).

The evangelist is failing in his duty to let down the nets and catch men, to use our Lord's simile (Luke v. 10), unless he both preaches the Gospel fully, and, according to the circumstances of the particular evangelistic venture, also proclaims the basic steps of repentance and faith, which our Lord (Mark i. 15-17), St. Peter (Acts ii. 38), St. Paul

(Acts xx. 21), and St. John (Rev. iii. 19, 20) all demanded. If the Holy Spirit has honoured his preaching, and made his instruction clear to his hearers, tired though he may be, he must *offer* personal help to those who may still be muddled, "unless some man should help them." No wonder the evangelist needs to be "purged and sanctified and meet for the Master's use" (2 Tim. ii. 21), and all who seek to engage in this work must feel, with the writer, their tragic ill-equipment for this task, unless God the Holy Spirit empowers them, but we must "evangelize or perish".

When I have finished an evangelistic sermon, I kneel, and remind myself that the Lord Jesus said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John vi. 44) and that the work of regeneration is God's work by His Spirit. I then remember that we are allowed in some small way to be "workers together with Him" (2 Cor. vi. 1), and then I claim the promise of the Lord Jesus that "All that the Father giveth me shall come to Me, and him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out" (John vi. 37). I then pray that some may have seen themselves as sinners before a holy God, and have also seen the Lord Jesus as the only Saviour, and, despite all the imperfections of the human instrument, have come face to face with Christ at Calvary. At the Cross their mind has been illuminated, their conscience disturbed, their emotions warmed, and their wills moved, until the Holy Spirit who convicts and illuminates, gently draws them as a total personality to a personal response of repentance and faith in Christ. In response to saving faith, He truly regenerates those who are "bound to perform" these promises made for them by their godparents at their baptism.

As evangelicals let us never withdraw from the costliness of total committal to complete evangelism in all its related phases of apostolic and prophetic scriptural proclamation, Gospel preaching and instruction, personal counselling and shepherding, and continuous teaching of the Word, that those for whom God may make us responsible, "having known the holy Scriptures" and so "become wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus", may become mature "men of God, perfect and throughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. iii. 15-17). The end product of evangelism is not only new converts but new evangelists.

In our present world situation it may be later than we think. Does not the Lord of the Harvest call upon us all to engage in a new task of sacrificial evangelism before it is too late? "Say not ye 'there are yet four months, and then cometh harvest?' behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal; that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together" (John iv. 35, 36).

There is a story which is only a story, although it is a very lovely one, about the Lord Jesus when He was received up again to heaven on Ascension Day. The angels welcomed Him home, and then as they gazed down from the ramparts of heaven to the earth which Christ had so recently left, they said to Him, "Master, what plan have you made to carry on the great work which it cost you your life blood to

begin? " Jesus said to them " I have left eleven men ". The angels turned to Him and said, " But, Master, if the eleven men fail, what other plan have you? " Jesus turned, and with a smile of trust and confidence said, " I have no other plan." It is a wonderful thing to realize that the Lord trusts the youngest Christian to carry on this great commission to make known to the world the saving facts of the Cross. Because Christ told us to be witnesses, (Acts i. 8) because the world needs Him, and because we want to serve Him, we as Christians *must* accept evangelistic responsibility. May the Lord of the Harvest bind us by the cords of His love to this costly work of the Harvest field.

Book Reviews

Reviewers in this Issue

R. J. Berry, Esq., M.A., Ph.D.	The Rev. James I. Packer, M.A., D.Phil.
The Rev. Owen Brandon, M.A.	The Rev. Canon A. W. Parsons, L.Th.
The Rev. Herbert M. Carson, M.A., B.D.	Arthur Pollard, Esq., B.A., B.Litt.
The Rev. Professor G. C. B. Davies, M.A., D.D.	The Rev. W. C. G. Proctor, M.A., B.D.
The Rev. Principal Michael M. Hennell, M.A.	The Rev. L. E. H. Stephens-Hodge, M.A.
The Rev. R. E. Higginson, M.A., B.D.	The Rev. Alan M. Stibbs, M.A.
The Rt. Rev. Frank Houghton, B.A.	The Rev. J. R. W. Stott, M.A.
The Rev. Philip E. Hughes, M.A., B.D., D.Litt.	The Rev. Professor R. V. G. Tasker, M.A., B.D.
The Rev. F. D. Kidner, M.A.	The Rt. Rev. R. R. Williams, D.D., Bishop of Leicester.
The Rev. Arthur R. Milroy, M.A.	The Rev. Principal J. Stafford Wright, M.A.

LORDSHIP AND DISCIPLESHIP.

By Edward Schweizer. (S.C.M. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 28) 136 pp. 10s. 6d.

Readers of earlier volumes in this series will not need to be warned that this, like the others, is a closely-reasoned detailed theological essay, fully furnished with foot-notes, mostly referring to German authorities. The thin format and innocuous cover are deceptive. None of the series are designed to be read in bed, or with your feet up! But those who have met Dr. Edward Schweizer at Continental Theological Conferences will expect to find something of his bright, enthusiastic nature and his obvious personal love for our Lord shining through a book with this title, and they will not be disappointed. Dr. Schweizer is New Testament Professor at Zürich.

It is really a study of New Testament Christology, not so formal as some which have appeared recently (e.g. that of Oscar Cullman) but still covering a good deal of the ground, while selecting one particular theme as the uniting feature of the study. The thesis of the book is briefly this. In the Gospels, our Lord is presented as One who called disciples to follow Him, which they did, with varying degrees of faithfulness. The fact that this theme is prominent in the Gospel tradition, preserved in the Early Church, suggests that membership in the Church still was thought of as a discipleship to and with the Risen Lord. This was no mere following of our example, but rather an identification with Christ, including both a sharing in His humiliation and death, and also in His exaltation. This leads to an examination of the theme "Discipleship after Easter", in which the great Christological passages of the Epistles are examined with reference to the theme of the disciple's identification with his Lord.

It is seen that the passages group themselves around two main passages, I Cor. xv. 3-5, and Phil. ii. 6-11. The former has as its underlying concept "for us" (cf. "for our sins", verse 3) while in Phil. ii. 6-11 the concept is "with him": the Church is joining in the tribute of all created things to the exalted Lord, and in this sense is ascending with Him in heart and mind.

The former group of passages, with its stress on the exaltation of a suffering servant of God, is essentially Palestinian in background; the latter, with its stress on a Divine Saviour coming into the world, that we might share His exaltation, is rather more Hellenistic, though not to the extent of any kind of Gnostic Docetism. In fact Dr. Schweizer's great point is that the translation of the Hebrew thought into a Hellenistic medium was carried through without any transformation of its essential content.

The book ends with a pointed question on the presentation of the Gospel today, hinting that a real measure of "translation" may be necessary but that this can be done with complete loyalty to the divine, supernatural content of the Gospel. This is a perpetual problem for the evangelist of every generation and, indeed, it might be said that St. John's Gospel was an answer to the very same question in the early days. One thing can certainly be said with confidence, namely, that we shall never translate loyally if we do not first understand intimately what has to be translated. In that process Dr. Schweizer's book can help us.

RONALD LEICESTER.

THE SPIRITUAL GOSPEL : THE INTERPRETATION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

By M. F. Wiles. (Cambridge University Press.) 182 pp. 25s.

This is an admirable piece of research by a younger Cambridge scholar into early Patristic literature, a field in which so many of the sons of that University have laboured with distinction. It consists for the most part of an objective and comparative study of the fragments that have survived of the Commentaries of Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Cyril of Alexandria on the Fourth Gospel. Reference is also made to the relevant comments of other early Christian writers, such as Clement of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and Augustine. We are presented in this volume with a large amount of material, carefully selected, clearly set out, and very fully documented. The comprehensive bibliography draws the reader's attention to the sources on which the study is based, and the indexes of Biblical and Patristic passages quoted, which occupy no less than fourteen pages of double columns, enable quick reference to be made to the treatment of any particular verse in the Gospel by the commentators concerned.

In successive chapters Mr. Wiles considers in detail the treatment by each commentator of such subjects as—the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptic Gospels, its historicity and symbolism, the interpretations of its "signs", its leading religious ideas, and the way it was used by the contending parties in the controversies about the two Natures of Christ. His main object is to be descriptive rather than critical, though he does not hesitate to point out what were in his judgment the strong and weak points in the methods of exegesis employed by the schools of Antioch and Alexandria. He regards Cyril as the greatest commentator of the three. Cyril's "sense of balance and good sense" enabled him to avoid the allegorical excesses of Origen, though it is admitted that his preoccupation with a dogmatic interpretation led him often far beyond the bounds of strict

exegesis. "This", says Mr. Wiles, rather surprisingly, "is a weakness but not an unmitigated loss". By contrast he says of the work of Theodore: "For all the honesty of his approach, the directness and practical good sense of many of his comments, his commentary as a whole is a disappointing book." It lacks "the breadth of spiritual discernment of Origen", and "remains too much within the limitations of the historical sphere".

Many may feel, however, as they read this interesting book, that the limitations of Theodore's spiritual discernment are preferable to some of the fantastic interpretations of the Alexandrians made in the supposed interests of orthodoxy and of an exaggerated sacramentalism. It would seem that sometimes, misled by a false interpretation of Clement of Alexandria's description of the Fourth Gospel as "the spiritual Gospel", and unduly influenced by the exegetical methods of their Gnostic opponents, these exegetes were again and again driven into fanciful and speculative "interpretations" far beyond anything warranted by the text. It is remarkable also how the same texts were used in different centuries to oppose diametrically opposite forms of heresy!

This volume should prove of lasting value to students both of the Fourth Gospel and of the doctrinal controversies of the Early Church.

R. V. G. TASKER.

GOD : CREATOR, SAVIOUR, SPIRIT.

By R. P. C. Hanson. (S.C.M.) 128 pp. 8s. 6d.

This is a welcome little book on the greatest of themes, the doctrine of God. It is easy to read, although it betrays wide learning and penetrating insight on the part of the author. Most clergymen, and many intelligent laymen, will feel that the moment is ripe for such a small, but systematic, work on a subject which is largely ignored, although basic to belief. Its value lies in the power to stimulate thought and to send the reader to larger works of reference for a further perusal of Christian teaching on the centre of our life and salvation. Yet inevitably it lacks something. This may be due to its theological form, or it may be due to the theological position of the author. It reflects closely the contemporary scene and is a faithful transcript of so much "biblical theology" in vogue.

Dr. R. P. C. Hanson is Senior Lecturer in Christian Theology in the University of Nottingham. The book contains the substance of four addresses given over a number of years to different audiences on the eternal realities of the Godhead as revealed in the Bible. After this crisp statement the final chapter appears as "The Formation of Dogma", which is academic in cast and reproduces a lecture delivered in the University of Nottingham to an audience not exclusively clerical.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the book is the attention devoted to the biblical doctrine of the wrath of God. "Most preachers and composers of prayers today treat the doctrine very much as the Victorians treated sex. It is there, but it must never be alluded to because it is in an undefined way shameful" (p. 37). With Barthian insight Dr. Hanson handles the delicate theme and endeavours to

provide the biblical focus for the benefit of the modern believer who has so often to correct erroneous ideas sown in childhood either by omission or wilful perversion of this wholesome doctrine. Fifteen pages are taken up by it within the compass of a small book. Here is a sincere attempt to redress the balance in a sane and helpful manner.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

CHRISTIAN HOLINESS.

By Stephen Neill. (Lutterworth.) 134 pp. 15s.

Can an Anglican handle the subject of *holiness* adequately? This is my sad reflection after reading this useful study on a subject of vital interest to the Christian Church today. Many will find this contribution to the theme of holiness disappointing; yet the book is well worth reading and good value for the money. It abounds in good illustrations and useful outlines and could become a handbook for several series of sermons, but it lacks the glow that kindles the human spirit and causes a deep longing for likeness to Christ. The impression is left on the mind that the author has consulted the best works on the subject of each chapter and given us the benefit of his wide reading and mature judgment.

The book contains the substance of the Carnahan Lectures delivered in July 1958 in the Evangelical Faculty of Theology in Buenos Aires. They were delivered in Spanish, repeated in other parts of South America and the Carribean, published in Spanish, and a revised text prepared in English.

Bishop Stephen Neill begins with the unutterable splendour of the Divine Holiness in the first chapter and reproduces Otto with a sprinkling of biblical references. In chapter two he reproduces B. B. Warfield in dealing with the Perfectionist error. The Conformist error in chapter three ought to be read by all Anglicans, for it provides a brief but penetrating survey of Christian history and the resulting mistakes of erroneous teaching. One point emphasized must be reiterated, namely, the need for a serious theological doctrine of conversion (p. 61). Perhaps the author from the wealth of his learning and the width of his experience and the depth of his sympathies will tackle this subject soon. Chapters four, five, and six, deal with the place of holiness, the spirit of holiness, and the question of conflict and temptation. The final chapter is perhaps the best one in the book: "What, then, do we preach?" It treats the persistence of moral pessimism realistically. Holiness is defined as mastery over life, by sharing in the wholeness and victory of Christ, and by acquiring the military characteristic of discipline, which is described as "the hardening of the will to go on acting, when the body and the mind are utterly exhausted, for that extra five minutes in which battles are won" (p. 119). Saints are sketched as possessing three qualities—equanimity, a sense of humour, and a deep compassion for others. The one unfailing requisite for canonization is heroic joy. Perhaps the faults in the book are due largely to the attempt to make a theological treatise into a manual of devotion.

R. E. HIGGINSON.

PATROLOGY.

By Berthold Altaner. Translated by Hilda C. Graef. (Nelson.) 660 pp. 60s.

An English version of this important work, the German original of which was first published in 1938, is most welcome. Dr. Altaner is Professor of Patrology and Liturgy in the University of Würzburg, and is of course an acknowledged authority in the field of patristic studies. His book, a veritable mine of information concerning the ecclesiastical fathers, is the fruit of great scholarly diligence. This translation is fully up to date, being based on the completely revised fifth German edition of 1958. It is furnished throughout with extensive bibliographies which, together with the literary and biographical information given in Dr. Altaner's text, constitute it an invaluable work of reference. Professor Altaner describes the time of the Fathers as the "first age of the Church", and this age he divides into three periods: (i) the time of foundation, from the end of the first century till Nicæa, 325; (ii) the peak period, from Nicæa to Chalcedon, 451; and (iii) the decline, from Chalcedon till the death of Isidore of Seville, 636, in the West, and till the death of John of Damascus, 749, in the East. It is to this temporal scheme that the pattern of the book conforms in general.

This volume may be taken as representative of the desire on the part of many Roman Catholic scholars of our day to disentangle their Church from the swathings of medieval scholasticism which officially bind its theology, by going back to a study of the early Fathers and their writings. This is apparent in the hope expressed by Professor Altaner that those who read his book "may be encouraged to study the writings of the Fathers themselves and thus be led to a deeper understanding of the spirit of the living Christian faith as expressed in their works". He points out, moreover, that "the sources methodically investigated by the patrologist furnish the Catholic dogmatic theologian with the necessary material for building up the proof from tradition". In this respect it is of particular interest to recall that, at the time when the question as to the advisability of promulgating the Assumption of Mary as an infallible dogma was still under discussion, Dr. Altaner cogently opposed it on the grounds that it was incapable of proof either from Scripture or from tradition. Such, however, is the power of authoritarianism that he and the numerous other German scholars who had concurred with his criticism submitted their intellects to the official decree once the dogma had been defined by the Pope, in 1950.

For this notable book we express our gratitude to the distinguished author, the translator, and the publisher.

PHILIP E. HUGHES.

THE DEGREES OF KNOWLEDGE.

By Jacques Maritain. Newly translated from the fourth French edition under the supervision of Gerald B. Phelan. (Geoffrey Bles) 476 pp. 50s.

It is over twenty years since Dr. Maritain's massive work first appeared in English translation. The publication of this, a new trans-

lation, has, says the author, meant the realization of a dream, since "the former translation was quite unsatisfactory, marred as it was by a great many misinterpretations and oversights". Moreover, the Appendices, "an integral part of the book", are now included. The translators have indeed been confronted with a formidable task, for this work, the product of one of the most erudite minds of contemporary Roman Catholicism, is marked both by intensity of thought and by complexity of terminology. It ranges over a great many fields, including those of modern physics, abstract philosophy, metaphysics, and mysticism. Dr. Maritain declares himself as one who "rigorously maintains the formal line of Thomistics", which is, of course, the officially decreed line for all Roman Catholic study and teaching. This is a great disadvantage, vehemently though the author dismisses criticisms of the Aristotelian-Thomistic synthesis. It means that all intellectual activity, now and hereafter, has to be compressed within a mould in which medieval concept and pre-Christian philosophy are compounded with each other in a manner which is at variance with the scriptural perspective of man and knowledge.

Is it not remarkable that a *magnum opus* such as this, by a professedly Christian philosopher, devoted to the important subject of epistemology, finds no place for the discussion of Holy Scripture as a cardinal source of man's knowledge concerning himself and his Creator? If it be answered that this is taken for granted, then we can but say that it plays an insignificant part and that the absence in general of genuinely scriptural categories is disturbing. The highest degree of knowledge is propounded by Dr. Maritain as the suprarational knowledge of mystical experience. The radical divorce between "nature" and "grace" which is characteristic of Thomism points to a failure to comprehend the unity of the whole man as created by God, and as fallen and redeemed; and this same divorce opens the way for the exaltation of mysticism as a means of escape from "nature" to a dialectical state of knowing and unknowing, to a vision of the invisible, which it is difficult to distinguish from the mystical experiences of non-Christian contemplatives—theosophists, Jewish cabbalists, and orientalists—whose philosophy derives or largely corresponds to the fundamental Pythagorean dualism of antiquity.

We cannot accept the presuppositions of this book, but none the less it remains an intellectual achievement of impressive proportions and the most important manifesto of neothomistic philosophy yet to appear.

PHILIP E. HUGHES.

THE FOUR LOVES.

By C. S. Lewis. (Geoffrey Bles.) 160 pp. 12s. 6d.

"Perhaps an analogy may help," says Dr. Lewis in the opening chapter of his new book. Of course it does and immediately we are back in that delightful word-picture gallery of which Dr. Lewis has for so long been both custodian and guide. In his company we begin to see what he sees and are put on our way to an understanding of the various kinds of human love and their relationship to the Divine Charity.

Dr. Lewis distinguishes three elements in human love : Gift-love, Need-love, and Appreciative love. An example of the first is that of a mother for her son, of the second that of a child for its mother, and of the third that of hero-worship. "In actual life, thank God, the three elements of love mix and succeed one another, moment by moment. Perhaps none of them except Need-love ever exists alone, in 'chemical' purity, for more than a few seconds" (pp. 26f.). The dangerous loves are the Gift-loves because they are most God-like and therefore most capable of becoming perverted into demons. In the main section of the book Dr. Lewis examines Affection, Friendship, and Eros showing first their strength and then their tendency to turn sour when treated as divine. In the final chapter on Charity he shows how all these human loves can be lifted up and transformed into Charity by the indwelling Christ.

Amongst the many good things in this book are the author's defence and analysis of human friendship, which is particularly welcome in an age which tends to attribute to Eros the underlying motive in most close relationships. Dr. Lewis's treatment of the sexual act within Eros, which he calls Venus, is to be welcomed. He suggests that Venus is a comic character not a tragic heroine; writers and sensualists have treated her too long with unwarranted solemnity. There are pleasant echoes from Dr. Lewis's earlier books—his remarks on the love of nature supplement what he has already written in *Miracles*, and Mrs. Fiddett comes to us straight from *Screwtape's* rogues gallery. Altogether this is a delightful and helpful book.

MICHAEL HENNEL.

ARCHBISHOP MOWLL: THE BIOGRAPHY OF HOWARD WEST KILVINTON MOWLL, ARCHBISHOP OF SYDNEY AND PRIMATE OF AUSTRALIA.

By Marcus L. Loane. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 262 pp. 21s.

Several wartime leaders have defined the qualities which make for effective leadership. They consist in a mixture of inherent gifts combined with a full opportunity to use them, and length of experience to develop them. The biography of Archbishop Mowll might well be subtitled: "A study in Evangelical leadership", for we see throughout his life gifts, opportunities, and experience all being used to the full for the glory of God, and to the great benefit of Evangelical witness throughout the world.

Born and brought up at Dover, and educated at the King's School, Canterbury, Mowll went up to Cambridge in 1909, and here the author makes the significant statement: "There were no other years in his life comparable from the point of view of spiritual values . . . the real gift which Cambridge had to offer . . . was Christian fellowship linked with positive direction for a life of service". He took a leading part in the difficult stand which the C.I.C.C.U. felt compelled to make at this time, "ruling with a rod of iron" as President, and in the Torrey mission, and the author's description of these years should be compared with the account in J.C. Pollock's *A Cambridge Movement*. It was also at this time that he acquired such life-long friends as H. Earnshaw Smith and A. W. Pitt-Pitts, and became an enthusiast in the cause of missions.

Mowll's call to Canada was most unexpected, but after ordination by Bishop Knox at Manchester, he proceeded in 1913 to Wycliffe College, Toronto, where for nine years he worked lecturing, and doing mission work in all parts of the Dominion, except for a short break as an Army Chaplain towards the end of the War. He returned to Canada with the idea that the door to the mission field had apparently closed, and was suddenly confronted late in 1921 with the call to assist Bishop Cassels in West China. Here his adventurous life included capture by brigands, and constant work in a disturbed and war-stricken country. Succeeding as diocesan in 1926, he occupied the "bridge" position between his patriarchal predecessor and the coming of the Chinese Church into its own. His great contribution was to forward this process by securing the transfer of real control from the missionaries' conferences to the diocesan synods.

He arrived at Sydney with some foreboding in 1934, knowing that his appointment as Archbishop was not altogether welcome. He had even been told by Archbishop Lang that he possessed neither the gifts nor the training for the See of Sydney. But he plunged into a round of activity which only an iron constitution could have supported. During the war years, he gave a magnificent lead to meet the spiritual challenges imposed by world-conflict, and at the close of 1946, with the death of Archbishop Le Fanu of Perth, he was voted Primate, which was a source of great satisfaction.

His doings in the post-war years consist in an almost bewildering number of journeys throughout the world, when he became a figure of international importance in the ecumenical movement. Two absorbing chapters on the Archbishop's character and ministry reveal the essential nature of the man, and no one could have written these more sensitively or with more authority than Bishop Loane. The Archbishop's faults are not glossed over; a certain dictatorialness of manner, a lack of consideration for colleagues, who at times appeared to receive the rebukes while his opponents received the praise; and an inability to delegate duties to others; but these were the weaknesses of a great man. They were the result of his vigorous and enthusiastic leadership. If he drove others, they knew that he drove himself still harder. In all his activities he was magnificently supported by his wife, on whom he leaned a great deal, and her death in 1957 was an immeasurable loss. His own passing ten months later brought widespread sorrow.

This finely written book is what we have come to expect from the author's previous work, and it gives a clear and sympathetic picture of "one of the greatest spiritual leaders in the history of Australia".

G. C. B. DAVIES

THE DUST OF COMBAT : A LIFE OF CHARLES KINGSLEY.

By R. B. Martin. (Faber and Faber.) 308 pp. 25s.

Harriet Beecher Stowe described Charles Kingsley as a "a nervous excitable being (who) talks with head, shoulders, arms, and hands" whilst George Eliot, reviewing *Westward Ho*, remarked that "the battle and the chase seem necessary to his existence". These quotations seem to sum up the subject of this biography. In a succession of causes and with unceasing energy he fretted his frail body to decay

Kingsley was not a great thinker, but he was a man of great social responsibility. His part in the Christian Socialism of the late eighteenthies and the fifties is well known, but he outgrew that phase and in the later years we find the patriot and the royalist. Also in those years we see him questioning the unthinking pro-Northern feelings of most Englishmen during the American Civil War. Both early and late he was the staunch Protestant, the man who recognized the pernicious character of the Tractarian Movement from its early years. In this respect, too, we should note his sense of social responsibility. He saw men and women being hoodwinked by the superficial attractions of the new, but wholly un-Anglican, High Churchmanship. This open, honest, straightforward, loyal son of the Church of England attacked Tractarianism in his private letters, in his novel *Yeast*, and finally in his controversy with Newman. Out of that controversy came the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, of which Mr. Martin thinks more highly than does this reviewer. Kingsley was no match for the renegade, subtle, unscrupulous, and disingenuous. It was like a fight between a dog and a serpent, one all wrath, the other all cunning. Set the portraits of the two men side by side (as this book lets us do) and you see the inevitable opposition—Kingsley masculine, assertive, determined; Newman frail, quiet, effeminate, perhaps discontented. This is a well written biography. There is a little repetition and, for English readers at any rate, some probably superfluous background material; and there is not enough criticism of Kingsley's writings. On the whole, however, Mr. Martin, who teaches English at Princeton, has placed us deeply in his debt.

ARTHUR POLLARD.

DANIEL HENRY CHARLES BARTLETT, M.A., D.D. A MEMOIR.

By G. W. Bromiley. (*Dr. Bartlett's Executors.*) 86 pp. 4s.
(Obtainable from *The English Churchman*, 69 Fleet Street,
E.C. 4.)

The preface gives the reason for the appearance of this memoir. Dr. Bartlett had himself left money in his will to assist in the publication of an account of the contest with liberal evangelicalism in the early 1920's. The plan decided upon by his executors was to produce a memoir of one who had played a leading part in the debates of the period, namely Dr. Bartlett himself.

To at least one reader this short biographical sketch has cleared away misconceptions as to the real character of the man. He is seen pre-eminently as a single-minded believer contending for what he believed to be principles vital to the Gospel. Certainly he was a strong character with remarkable powers of leadership; and there seems to be just a hint of his difficulty in relinquishing his tasks to his successors. Yet with all the vigour of his opposition to teaching which he believed to be subversive of biblical truth, he avoided a great deal of the bitterness which can mar theological controversy. It was one of his chief opponents, Canon Guy Rogers, who wrote to him, "I love you for your sense of humour . . . and always admire your sincerity."

His pastoral ministry tends to be eclipsed by his later work as a leader of conservative evangelicalism and as a missionary statesman; but it was in many ways outstanding. The highlight of this period was

his time in Liverpool, where he displayed great courage in facing the total loss of his church through fire. The readiness of many to turn to him for advice is a token of the influence he wielded.

It was, however, the part he played in the crisis within C.M.S. which led to the formation of B.C.M.S. for which he will be especially remembered. The story makes sad reading. Yet it is at this point that this book is valuable, not as a means of opening old wounds, but rather as a discussion of the issues that were at stake, and as a means of pointing the way forward for evangelicals in the future.

Professor Bromiley clearly shews that Dr. Bartlett's concern was not primarily with the doctrine of Scripture, though that was of course prominent, but with the person of Christ. The issue was really between the kenotic conception of a Christ who could be mistaken on matters of fact and the Christ of historic Christianity. He was accused of drawing in Christ to bolster his own view of Scripture, whereas he saw more clearly than his opponents that Christ's person and authority were inevitably involved. He could not accept a Nestorian Christ in which the unity of the person was dissolved into infallible and fallible elements.

The current debate on the doctrine of Scripture moves in a different climate of thought from 1920. But the major contribution of Dr. Bartlett to the debate at that period is still relevant. Any approach to a true view of Scripture must be essentially Christological; and must take Scripture as it is, and not as we would like it to be. "The true point," says Professor Bromiley, "is to give Christ His legitimate place as the centre and Lord of Scripture, working out from this centre and lordship instead of working from another centre and under another lordship to another Christ on the periphery."

HERBERT M. CARSON.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER : A STUDY OF HIS PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.

By Gabriel Langfeldt. (Allen and Unwin.) 120 pp. 12s. 6d.

The author of this brief study of Dr. Schweitzer's philosophy of life is a well-known Norwegian psychiatrist, who makes no Christian profession. Apparently after Schweitzer had visited Norway an unhappy controversy developed in the Norwegian press on the question whether Schweitzer can be regarded, or even regards himself, as a Christian in the truest sense of the word. It will come as a shock to thousands of Christians throughout the world who have regarded him as perhaps the most outstanding modern exemplar of Christian self-sacrifice that such a question could come up for discussion. As one who is apparently an agnostic, Professor Langfeldt approaches the subject dispassionately. It is easy to show from Schweitzer's own writings that he has adopted fairly extreme views concerning the authenticity of Holy Scripture. Thus he regards St. John's Gospel as largely legendary, St. Luke as "of doubtful worth", and only St. Matthew and St. Mark (excluding the "legendary" accounts of the birth of our Lord in Matthew, chapters i and ii) as reliable sources. Yet he has "an almost mystical emotional attachment" to the Person of Jesus Christ, and is committed to the task of establishing

the kingdom of God. Often it would appear that he uses terms such as "God" and "prayer" in a sense which is scarcely intelligible or acceptable to ordinary Christians. Clearly we cannot turn to Schweitzer for teaching concerning "the faith once delivered to the saints", but neither ought we to judge his spiritual standing in the sight of God. Meanwhile it is still true that in his humility and compassion, and in his devotion to the task of medical work at Lambarene, he puts many of us to shame.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

THE REUNION OF THE CHURCH : A DEFENCE OF THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME.

By Lesslie Newbigin. (S.C.M.) 192 pp. 21s.

This is not a new book, but a new and revised edition of the important work on the reunion of the Church published in 1948, but written before the Church of South India had been formally constituted. Writing now after twelve years' experience as a Bishop of that Church, Dr. Newbigin has prepared a new introduction which provides a most useful commentary on the extent to which its aspirations have been fulfilled, and also a very pertinent comparison between the proposals for union in North India (and in Ceylon) and the method actually followed in South India. With regard to South India, it appears that episcopacy, accepted by some chiefly because union was otherwise impossible, is now so valued for its own sake that "the position of the Bishop as the Chief Pastor of the flock in each area has become something that hardly anyone would wish even to think of abandoning" (p. 31). On the other hand, there is not the least likelihood that, after the 30-year period of "growing together", the attitude of the Church of South India to non-episcopal communions will have become more rigid. If South India is to be in any sense a model for much wider unions, it cannot un-church the groups, other than Anglican, from which it sprang. In other words, it cannot bid for the full recognition of the Anglican Communion which was not granted at Lambeth, 1958, by admitting that the ministries of other churches are less than fully "valid" as well as "real".

With regard to the comparison between South India and North India or Ceylon, Bishop Newbigin strongly defends the method adopted in South India, whereby the complete unification of ministries was not achieved at the outset. The Lambeth Conference, on the other hand, favours the method proposed for the North India and the Ceylon schemes of union, chiefly because the services inaugurating union would provide the equivalent of episcopal ordination for all. This "supplemental ordination" is trenchantly criticized by Dr. Newbigin, both in the introduction and in later chapters. It is impossible to define what exactly it would involve for Anglicans already ordained, yet for non-Anglicans it would be regarded (at least by many Anglicans) as the indispensable introduction to a fully valid ministry. Thus there would be a lamentable confusion in the minds of many participants in this solemn ceremony concerning what they were to expect to receive from God as a result of it. We should like to assure Bishop Newbigin that the Lambeth Statement does not reflect the view of Evangelicals

in the Church of England, who have no hesitation in recognizing the validity of the orders of Free Church ministers, and who yearn for the full expression of such recognition in intercommunion.

Evangelicals will value the emphasis which the author places on justification by faith, and the continuous exercise of personal faith in a living Saviour through the power of the indwelling Spirit.

If a criticism may be permitted, it is that insufficient weight is given to the fact that there is an invisible Church which is not co-terminous with the visible. It is surely the invisible Church, and not the visible, which is the true Body of Christ. Is it strictly true to say that "the Church, i.e., the visible institution, is the temple of the Holy Spirit" (p. 55)? The fact that many of us believe otherwise ought not to affect our deep desire for the healing of "our unhappy divisions".

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

By Ronald S. Wallace. (*Oliver and Boyd.*) 349 pp. 27s. 6d.

Dr. Wallace's method of expounding Calvin, here as in his earlier book *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*, is to take Calvin's writings as a whole and make a plain cross-sectional analysis of the strands of thoughts found in them, not bothering to distinguish early work from late nor watching for signs of development or shifts of emphasis. And this method, which would be very naïve for studying most writers who began producing in their twenties, is entirely right; for Calvin's thought never developed, and his emphases never changed. All that was ever there was there from the first. Such consistency is remarkable but not inexplicable. It simply reflects the consistency of the Bible. For Calvin always served the Word. He did not spin theology out of his head. He did not build a speculative system; indeed, he made it his business to oppose all such systems. Calvin the apostle of logic who (as Brunetière put it) "reasons on the attributes of God just as he would have reasoned on the properties of a triangle or of a sphere" never existed; he is a nineteenth-century turnip ghost. The real Calvin was concerned as all costs to be, not systematic by merely human standards, but Biblical. To him there was no such thing as Calvinism; there was only the Bible. He held what he held because he found it in Scripture. His one aim was to see and say what the Bible says—no more, and no less.

The words "no less" are important, for it is just here that Calvin's greatness lies. He saw so much of what is in Scripture. Hence his theology is rich, broad, and balanced to a degree that still sets it in a class by itself. No Biblical theologian was ever less lopsided and narrow. If proof of this assertion is required (and we fear that it still is in some quarters), Dr. Wallace's book alone provides all that we need.

It is a straightforward exposition, without critical comment, divided into six parts. In Part I, we watch Calvin laying the theological foundations of the Christian life in terms of union with Christ. The other parts display the Christian life as one of dying and rising with Christ by repentance; of order, controlled by God's law; of nurture

through the means of grace in the Church ; of fighting faith, persistent prayer, and joyful hope. The selection and arrangement of material is unobtrusively excellent. And the abiding impression is one of broad, rich Biblical thinking and, on that basis, of Christian realism and robust good sense. If Calvin had written a commentary on Proverbs, it would clearly have been brilliant.

Moreover, though Dr. Wallace's style is calm enough, Calvin's own tremendous sense of spiritual realities comes through constantly, and the book is as searching and sobering to the heart as it is satisfying to the mind.

One small limitation may be mentioned. Dr. Wallace has confined himself to giving an exhaustive analysis of all the relevant lines of thought found anywhere in Calvin's expository writing. His book would have been enriched if this had been balanced somewhere by a statement as to which points Calvin regarded as fundamental and stressed most: a chapter, perhaps, reviewing as a unit the little treatise on the Christian life in *Inst.* III. vi-x. It does not follow that we have seen the wood even when we have seen all the trees that are in the wood.

J. I. PACKER.

PREDESTINATION AND OTHER PAPERS.

By Pierre Maury. (S.C.M.) 109 pp. 12s. 6d.

In a memoir at the beginning of this book, Dr. Robert Mackie says ; " Pierre Maury was a rare Frenchman who broke the language barrier in middle life, and was increasingly holding the attention of English-speaking people in World Council meetings since the war." No less a person than Karl Barth writes the Foreword, in which he says : " One can certainly say that it was he who contributed decisively to giving my thoughts on this point (*sc.* election) their fundamental direction. Until I read his study, I had met no one who had dealt with the question so freshly and daringly."

With these commendations, one turns over the pages of this book with great expectations, and one is not disappointed. There is indeed a freshness about the thinking of the author that starts one's own mind into activity. The man pulsates behind the writing in a remarkable way. One senses quickly that the author was one who loved his Bible, one who embodied the true ecumenical spirit, one who genuinely practised honesty of mind, and above all one who seemed truly to be living " at one " with God in Christ.

Let him be heard speaking about the Bible :

Ah ! If only we could learn to read the Bible as the book of those promises : that is to say, not as a collection of more or less noble or deep thoughts, more or less acceptable to our wisdom or our egotism, but as the record of pledges made to us weak men by Almighty God. What limit would there be then to the power of the Scriptures, and to the value we should set upon them, instead of reading them with difficulty, and even with boredom ! Then we should live like men and women who are *waiting* for something—waiting for God to keep His word. There would be an end to the discouragement, the boredom, and the

despair of our sad, sick hearts which wait for nothing but the end of their empty existence ! (p. 82).

On the deep theme of Predestination, what impression does one receive from the main essay of the volume ? The discussion is turned from the idea of a certain *number* saved and the rest damned to the contemplation of the revelation of the will of God in Jesus Christ. Christ has always been with God, and is indeed God ; so in Him we find our election *and* our rejection. The paradoxes of Scripture certainly are given more place, and have light thrown upon them, by this mode of thought. It is properly claimed by the author to be a Scriptural mode of thought as distinct from a philosophical ; and to have pastoral value, rather than dogmatic achievement.

Whether the general theological reader will buy this book may be doubtful ; but anyone who knew Pierre Maury will certainly prize this well-produced volume in memory of a notable personality, and as a constant stimulus to their own thinking.

W. C. G. PROCTOR.

MYTH AND REALITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By Brevard S. Childs. (S.C.M.) 112 pp. 9s. 6d.

This is No. 27 in the "Studies in Biblical Theology", and it well deserves its place in this useful series. There are nowadays few books on the Old Testament which make no mention of myth, and the sense in which the term is used varies disconcertingly from author to author. So it is not the least of the merits of this study that it opens with a careful classification of such uses and an exposition of what appear to be the essential features of the mythical account of reality, gleaned from a comparison of various religions. Then, having demonstrated the incompatibility between mythical and historical thinking, Dr. Childs proceeds to his main task, which is to show what happens when the Old Testament view of reality comes to grips with the mythical view. He does this by examining at some length half a dozen passages which appear to make use of fragments of myths, and by analysing, in a further chapter, the mythical and the biblical concepts of time and space. He concludes with a discussion of the theological questions we are left with when we have drawn these distinctions: namely, "What is the nature of the reality of which the Bible is a witness ?"

The present reviewer is not at all convinced that the particular passages chosen for discussion (Gen. i. 1-2; iii. 1-5; vi. 1-4; Ex. iv. 24-26; Is. xi. 6-9; xiv. 12-21) contain material borrowed from mythology (the most tangible link with a specific, known myth is *tehom* in Gen. i. 2; and this has now come under question) (see J. V. Kinnier Wilson in *Documents from Old Testament Times*, p. 14); nevertheless the discussion is extremely able and discriminating, and the exposition at times brilliant. The dialogue between the serpent and Eve is handled with great insight; on the other hand the author seems to have been dazzled by his ingenuity in the discussion of the circumcision of Moses. He brushes aside the ostensible significance of this as an enforced acknowledgment of the Abrahamic covenant, on the assumption that such a significance is a later, because a priestly, development, and goes

on to interpret the incident as the historicizing of a myth into a supposed event in the life of Moses.

With material as unhistorical as this in the Old Testament "history" (as seen through the eyes of this scholarship), it is not hard to understand why modern scholars have wrestled hard with the notion of such history as a medium of revelation. It is paradoxical to find myth apparently dispossessed by history and then blandly reappearing in history's stolen clothes to apply for reinstatement. Dr. Childs rejects various recent attempts to redefine history, and makes the penetrating comment on G. E. Wright's quest in *God Who Acts*, that "the theological objections to the 'search for the historical Jesus' can also be applied to this search for the 'historical Israel'". His own solution is to see the New Israel (only realized in Christ) as the reality to which the Old Testament bears witness, and to find that witness displayed "in the total experience of Israel"—i.e., not only in the events that really happened to her, but in her ideas of what happened, and even in her rejection of what God was doing.

If, to this reviewer, this solution seems over-subtle, it is reached after patient, learned, and often illuminating argument. It is a notable contribution to the debate.

F. D. KIDNER.

INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTIANITY.

By Paul Hessert. (Allen and Unwin). 383 pp. 30s.

This book is carefully planned, well written, and attractively printed. It was first published in U.S.A. in 1958. Its author lectures at Illinois Wesleyan University. Its title is a true indication of its contents; its aim is to introduce the serious, inquiring student to an informed appreciation of Christianity. Its six divisions deal with Preliminary Considerations; Revelation, the Bible and Faith; the Biblical Proclamation; God and Man; God and the World; the Church and Christian Hope.

Its sub-title describes it as "A Dynamic Examination of a Living Faith." This appropriately indicates that prominence is given to life and experience. The author's approach is confessedly existential, and consequently predominantly subjective. There is a pleasing theological awareness and emphasis, but an unwillingness to become doctrinal still less definitely dogmatic.

Divine revelation is interpreted as an event in which God confronts us demanding personal response, rather than as a disclosure of information to be intellectually apprehended. The Bible is chiefly viewed as a record of significant acts of God, or as testimony of men's encounter with God, which is meant by the present testimony of the Spirit to help us to experience similar "revelation". Fundamentalism and modernism are alike criticized for giving too much attention to secondary elements. For "revelation cannot guarantee the truth of what is rightfully a matter of scientific or historical investigation and confirmation." So concerning the Virgin Birth, Mr. Hessert writes: "We need not argue the biology of this, either for or against it; we need to understand that the most important aspect of the doctrine is

theological." Similarly, the second coming of Christ, the last judgment and the resurrection are "images that convey significant meanings but which cannot be literally interpreted".

The survey of Christian faith and practice is comprehensive and non-denominational. Different views are briefly summarized. A Roman Catholic Catechism is listed among current Protestant Confessions. Universalism, conditional immortality, as well as eternal life in heaven and eternal punishment in hell, are all summarized; and each is said to find support in some scripture passages.

The merits of the book are that it offers helpful instruction and emphatically suggests that true Christianity is personal knowledge of the living God. Its weaknesses are that ultimately it makes historical truth unimportant, and offers no final authority or criterion greater than subjective experience.

A. M. STIBBS

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE IN THE FULNESS OF THE CHURCH.

Edited by Kenneth M. Carey. (Dacre Press.) 132 pp. 8s. 6d.

In the debate on the significance of episcopacy, this book of six essays by different authors has made a contribution that cannot be ignored. This second edition is identical with the first, except that the original introduction and final chapter, which related to the Church of South India, have been omitted. There is now a brief introduction by the Editor and an equally brief appendix by K. J. Woollcombe in which he modifies a view which he had put forward in the earlier edition. While repudiating the doctrine that the episcopate is a *ministry essential* to the constitution of the Church, it is the contention of this symposium that it is of the *plene esse* of the Church, guaranteeing an historic apostolic succession as "the outward sign and instrument of the church's unity". Consequently, viewed in this way as necessary to the fulness of the Church, episcopacy should be regarded as the focal point of any scheme for the reunion of the separated churches. Where non-episcopal orders are concerned, it is not their validity but their plenitude that is called in question; they are regarded as defective rather than an invalid, and what is lacking may, it is maintained, be made good by the common acceptance of the historic episcopate. The disabilities of this *via media* are, in our judgment, considerable; but they cannot be discussed here. The whole question of episcopacy and the ministry is one which demands much fuller investigation than it has so far received from Reformed scholars of the present day.

PHILIP E. HUGHES

A HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

By Williston Walker. Revised by Cyril C. Richardson, Wilhelm Pauck, and Robert T. Handy. (T. & T. Clark.) 586 pp. 42s.

The appearance of a new edition of "Williston Walker" is like the return of an old friend. This *History* continues to be a work of excellence, so much so that the revisors have found it unnecessary to make major alterations, with the exception, as was to be expected, of the final section which is devoted to a survey of Modern Christianity.

The bibliography has also been brought up to date and greatly improved in format. In general, the labours of the revisers have been to good purpose, though much that has been added with a view to covering the period since Williston Walker's day is (perhaps almost inevitably in a task of this nature) too cursory to be satisfying, and it would not be difficult to criticize it for omissions and deficiencies. But this volume remains essentially the work of Williston Walker. We commend it to students of Church History and to all who have an appreciation of learning that is both extensive and balanced.

PHILIP E. HUGHES.

PERSONAL DECLENSION AND REVIVAL OF RELIGION IN THE SOUL.

By Octavius Winslow. (*Banner of Truth Trust.*) 203 pp. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Octavius Winslow (1808-1878) was an eminent Nonconformist minister, a descendant of the New England Puritan, Edward Winslow. He held pastorates in Leamington Spa, Bath, and Brighton, and his writings were widely read and greatly valued by Christians of all denominations. The Banner of Truth Trust has included this present volume in a series of 19th century works by such well-known divines as Spurgeon, Smeaton, and Hodge, which are being republished with a view to strengthening the faith of 20th century Christians. (Is it because preachers of today, by and large, offer a far more meagre diet with less nutritional value?) Dr. Winslow was concerned because he judged that there were many believers whose spiritual life was in a state of decline without their being aware of it, and his aim is to fix "the eye of the believer . . . upon the state of his own personal religion", in order that he may answer "the solemn and searching enquiry, What is the spiritual state of my soul before God?" Surely there is a place for such introspection if (as in the present volume) an accurate diagnosis of the patient's condition leads to a clear presentation of the possibility and the means of recovery of spiritual health. The chapters on declension in love, in faith, in prayer, and in connection with doctrinal error, may well stir the reader to self-examination. But they exalt Christ, and point continually to Him who restores, revives, strengthens, and re-commissions the backslider. But for their length, and phraseology to which our modern ears are not attuned, they might well have been addresses given on the Monday evening of a Keswick Convention. For instance, here are the steps by which Dr. Winslow suggests that a declension in love may be arrested:

- (1) Trace out and crucify the cause of your declension in love.
- (2) Draw largely from the fount of love in God.
- (3) Deal much and closely with a crucified Saviour, and, lastly,
- (4) Remember that though your love has waxed cold, the love of God thy Father towards thee has undergone no diminution.

FRANK HOUGHTON, Bishop.

THE DEATH OF DEATH IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

By John Owen. (*Banner of Truth Trust.*) 312 pp. 13s. 6d.

Calvinism is topical once again, and it is good therefore that the Banner of Truth Trust should be making available some of the impor-

tant statements of the English Calvinists. (They should consider re-issuing Toplady's *The Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England*.) John Owen's *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ* originally appeared in 1647. In this publication it is reprinted from the 1852 edition of Owen's Works, and is prefaced with a very fine introduction by Dr. J. I. Packer.

Owen was a leading Puritan divine and during the Commonwealth, Dean of Christ Church and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford. J. C. Ryle said of him that "he had more learning and sound knowledge of Scripture in his little finger than many who depreciate him have in their whole bodies", and commended him for the "complete, Scriptural, and exhaustive treatment" of the subjects he handles. One is tempted to alter "exhaustive" to "exhausting", for Owen's thoroughness can be just that. The book under review is a massive statement against the theory of universal redemption. There is no denying the power of Owen's logic, once one has cut a way through the jungle of his style. Following the order of this argument is made easier by an excellent Analysis which Dr. Packer has provided.

There are things in this book with which many Anglicans will find it hard to agree completely. The Calvinism is too rigorous. We have to remember also that the work issues from a period of harsh polemics. Incidentally, one must regret one or two unnecessary asperities in the introduction. Nevertheless, one must accept that there are some queer doctrines held and taught in the Church of England today, not least about the meaning of the Atonement. In this connection Owen's treatise, and especially Book II, is a particularly valuable antidote. In other respects, however, most Anglicans will prefer the moderate Calvinism of a man like Charles Simeon to the rigid position of Owen. His logic is intolerant of the paradoxes which defy systematizers and with which Scripture abounds. The appearance of this book is, nevertheless, to be welcomed. The Puritans with their "strong meat" have much to contribute to an age in which Biblical theology seems to be regaining the attention it has always deserved.

ARTHUR POLLARD.

AN ALARM TO THE UNCONVERTED.

By Joseph Alleine. (*Banner of Truth Trust.*) 111 pp. 6s.

The reprinting of this book by the Puritan, Joseph Alleine (1634-1668), is to be welcomed at a time when so much interest is centred upon the subject of Conversion from both academic and practical points of view.

A very useful Biographical Introduction is supplied by Iain Murray, placing the book in its general historical setting and showing how its message grew out of Alleine's own deep religious experience. One impression left on the mind of a modern reader must surely be what in present-day language might be called the deep psychological insight of the man. Another impression is his clear thinking. Conversion, he says, is not the taking upon us the profession of Christianity; it is not putting on the badge of Christ in Baptism; it does not lie in moral righteousness; it does not consist in an external conformity to the rules

of piety; it is not the chaining up of corruption by education, human laws, or the force of affliction; it does not consist in illumination or conviction or in a superficial change or partial reformation. It must extend "to the whole man, to the mind, to the members, to the motions of the whole life". Conversion turns the balance of the judgment, the bias of the will, and the bent of the affections; it changes the dispositions, and sets a new course for man's life and behaviour.

Of course, the language and imagery of the book are thoroughly Puritan and typical of the age in which it was written. On the dust cover it is stated: "This book will provide the reader with a clear and simple statement of what the Christian Gospel really is." One may wonder about that. The book can hardly be regarded as an adequate exposition of the Gospel for today; but it is, as Iain Murray says, "a true model of Puritan evangelism," and it is as such that this reviewer sees its value.

OWEN BRANDON.

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.

By George Eldon Ladd. (Paternoster.) 143 pp. 10s. 6d.

"When a gulf exists between the lecture-room and the pulpit, sterility in the class-room and superficiality in the pulpit often result." So saying, our author, who is Professor of Biblical Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, enters upon a serious study of the Bible doctrine of the Kingdom of God in terms which he describes as "proclamation". This book is the fruit of years of labour in New Testament studies. Dr. Ladd expounds the thesis that "the Kingdom of God in the New Testament is the redemptive work of God active in history for the defeat of His enemies, bringing to men the blessings of the divine reign" (p. 107.) He deals carefully with all the various aspects of the Kingdom of God in Scripture and discusses at length the meaning of the Kingdom in terms of its present and future significance. By a series of simple, novel diagrams he shows the relationship between such Biblical concepts as the Creation of the World, This Age, the Parousia, the Millennium, the First and Second Resurrections, and The Age to Come, according to the pre-millennial interpretation. Dr. Ladd devotes a chapter to a discussion of the problem of "The Kingdom, Israel, and the Church". Our Lord's birth did not fulfil any of the popular messianic hopes. He came, not to bring the Evil Age to an end and inaugurate the Age to Come, but rather to bring the powers of the future Age to men in the midst of the present evil Age; and this mission involved His death. The Church is not the Kingdom, but it is the instrument of the Kingdom. "The Kingdom of God which in the Old Testament dispensation was manifested in Israel is now working in the world through the Church."

The book can be described as thoroughly Biblical, conservatively evangelical, and, as the author says, "proclamatory". It has two useful Indexes, one of Subjects and one of Scripture Passages. It is commended in a brief Introduction by Professor F. F. Bruce.

OWEN BRANDON.

FAITH IS THE VICTORY: DEVOTIONAL STUDIES IN THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

By E. M. Blaiklock. (*Paternoster.*) 64 pp. 5s.

These devotional studies were originally given by Professor Blaiklock at the Keswick Convention. The book is divided into four chapters, entitled "God is Light", "The World", "God is Love", and "The Victory". Each chapter is introduced by the author's own translation of the passage to be studied and concludes with a prayer of his composition.

Three principles appear to govern the treatment. First, the Epistle was written to refute the teaching of Cerinthus. John is found therefore, to refer to his fundamental Christological heresy, esoteric claims, and indifference to morality. Secondly, "the letter formed a sermon upon the Gospel". "The two books should always be read side by side in mutual commentary". Professor Blaiklock does, in fact, draw helpfully from the Gospel in order to illumine the Epistle. Thirdly, the author is convinced that the problems confronting the first century Church are our contemporary problems too. He is therefore, constantly alluding to present-day temptations to compromise, to the persecuting world, and to liberal theology.

The reader must not expect to find, within the small compass of these sixty-four pages, a detailed commentary on St. John's First Epistle. There are a number of linguistic titbits concerning the tenses of verbs and the meaning of words, as one would expect from the Professor of Classics in the University of Auckland. The book is also liberally studded with quotations from Plato and Sophocles, Tacitus and Pliny, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Jerome, Bunyan, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and others.

But inevitably, the treatment is uneven, and there are many omissions. There is no reference, for instance, to the "propitiation" (ii. 2 and iv. 10) or to Him who "came by water and blood" (v. 6). Nevertheless, Professor Blaiklock's devotional studies in the Epistle are a reliable, suggestive, and at times moving, introduction to its main themes.

J. R. W. STOTT

THE APOSTOLIC DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL : CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By F. F. Bruce. (*I.V.F.*) 95 pp. 3s. 6d.

In the belief that a study of New Testament apologetic may help us to rediscover lines along which the defence of the faith should be conducted in our own day, Dr. Bruce, now the Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester, has published five lectures which he gave on this subject in April, 1958, at Calvin College, Michigan, under the auspices of the Calvin Foundation. He reminds us that apologetic, like every other form of Christian witness, must have as its primary object the winning of men for Christ, and in this particular the apologists of the first century afford us an example which we would do well to follow. In examining their different methods we are also brought to realize that while the gospel itself is unchanging, the means for its defence may vary in accordance

with the situation in which the apologist may find himself. Dr. Bruce not only sheds a flood of light on the true meaning and method of apologetic but also provides us with stimulating expositions of such New Testament books as Acts, Galatians, Colossians, Jude, Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel.

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

TYNDALE LECTURES.

(Tyndale Press.) 1s. 6d. each.

Three Tyndale lectures have recently been published. In *THE REVELATION OF THE DIVINE NAME* (31 pp.), J. A. Motyer, Vice-Principal of Clifton Theological College, claims that the interpretation, based largely on our English versions, of Exodus vi. 2, 3 as indicative of a new departure in the nomenclature of the Almighty is entirely mistaken. What was new was not the *name*, Yahweh, but its *significance*, now to be made abundantly clear by the events of the Exodus. The passage cannot therefore be taken for a peg upon which to hang a documentary theory of the Pentateuch in terms of variant usage of the Divine Names. His interpretation of *beshem* as "in the character of" is, in the opinion of your reviewer, completely convincing.

THE WORD OF THE LORD IN JEREMIAH (20 pp.), by J. G. S. S. Thomson, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in Columbia Theological Seminary, is a slighter volume. Nowhere more than in Jeremiah, says Dr. Thomson, is the dynamic quality of the Word of the Lord made evident. The prophet's experiences reveal to us what in the Old Testament really constituted a genuine ministry of the Word. The result is almost a theory of divine dictation. Dr. Thomson adds, however, the observation that the Word of the Lord must be transposed into a human key in order to become humanly intelligible, and so the personality of the prophet and his willingness to co-operate have a part to play.

In *LUTHER'S PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION* (36 pp.) Dr. A. Skevington Wood, Methodist Minister in the York Wesley Circuit, shows that Luther's discovery of the meaning of justification by faith transformed for him the whole study of the Bible and supplied him with an overall hermeneutical clue. Scripture is in itself a sufficient rule of faith when it is accepted as the fully inspired Word of God. The principles which follow from this are here drawn out, usually in Luther's own words, and we are grateful for this handy presentation of a theme which has so much relevance today.

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

TORCH COMMENTARIES

HOSEA.

Introduction and Commentary, by G. A. F. Knight. (S.C.M.) 127 pp. 9s. 6d.

Dr. Knight, lecturer in Biblical Studies in the University of St. Andrews, has already contributed two volumes in the Old Testament section of the popular Torch series of commentaries. This third volume is well up to the standard of the other two, and is a profitable study of "the only collection of prophetic material that we possess which emerged from the northern kingdom of Israel". Hosea was "one of the great

personalities of history", acutely aware of the significance of contemporary political and social events, and charged with a message of God's outraged but persistent love for Israel, on the strength of which Hosea was able to woo his own wayward lover back to himself and so proclaim by life as well as lip the Gospel of hope entrusted to him. In his last paragraph our commentator challenges the reader to ask himself the question—how would he apply this message of Hosea to his own knowledge and experience of Israel's God? This fine exposition will greatly facilitate such an application.

THE EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY, TITUS AND PHILEMON.

Introduction and Commentary, by A. R. C. Leaney. (S.C.M.)
144 pp. 10s. 6d.

Both Philemon and the three Pastoral Epistles are missing from the admittedly incomplete Chester-Beatty codex of the Pauline Epistles which dates from the third century. But whereas the Pauline authorship of Philemon is fully accepted, Mr. Leaney, following P. N. Harrison, believes that 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus were the work of a Paulinist who, writing about A.D. 90, incorporated into the last two of these letters some genuine fragments of St. Paul. The warrant for such use and adaptation of Pauline material is found, rather precariously, in 2 Tim. ii. 2. The theory rests on a rejection of the traditional idea of a second Roman imprisonment for Paul and on the attempt to fit the "genuine fragments" into the history of the Acts of the Apostles. Lack of creative thought in the Pastorals may, however, comport well with the assumption that they belong to the last few months of the apostle's life, and many words which Harrison branded as "second century" are already found in the Septuagint, as Donald Guthrie showed in his Tyndale lecture of 1955. It is significant that neither this lecture nor E. K. Simpson's article in the *Evangelical Quarterly* (1939) on the authorship and authenticity of the Pastorals are quoted in this commentary or listed in the bibliography. Which means that the reader is left with a one-sided picture of the critical problem.

L. E. H. STEPHENS-HODGE.

THE FAITH OF A PHYSICIST.

By H. E. Huntley. (Geoffrey Bles.) 159 pp. 16s.

Science is capable of giving only a limited and selective view of the world. The account "science" produces is the result of the interplay of the individual conclusions and pronouncements of men who have studied Natural Law. Hence there is much that is outside the terms of science: to take only one example, science can have no concern with miracles because they are, by definition, infringements of Natural Law. Professor Huntley fails to make this distinction in his book. His thesis is, that since the scientist (more strictly the physicist), is continually in intimate contact with God's creation, he is in a peculiarly favoured position for making certain definite affirmations about the Creator and His work. In his eagerness to prove this point, it is not surprising that he introduces some rather novel statements. For example, Huntley on scientific method would be viewed askance by more conventional philosophers of science: "The physicist puts his

trust not so much in his interpretation of his detailed discoveries, or in his tentative theories, as in his *method*, in his flair for asking the right questions, and also in the character and reliability of the Source of all the answers." The book is full of similar half-truths, as well as many that are even more doubtful, such as the statement that "Christ's promise of the Spirit who 'shall guide you into all the truth', is in our day finding its fulfilment in Science". This is a great pity, because the main theme of the book is good. Starting from a comparison of a scientific and non-scientific education, Huntley shows that the only real deficiency in the former is in the understanding of personal relationships, and that this flaw is to some extent balanced by the knowledge and reverence which follows from a close contact with God's workings in creation. From this the author concludes that we must beware lest "our world is too small". This is a point well worth emphasizing: it is an aspect of the problem of maintaining the correct relationship between being "in the world and not of it", and any new slant on this perennial problem ought to be of interest. It is unfortunate that the occasional twists of fact and the decidedly infelicitous phraseology make this a book which cannot be recommended wholeheartedly.

R. J. BERRY.

FAITHFUL WITNESSES: RECORDS OF EARLY CHRISTIAN MARTYRS.

By Edward Rochie Hardy. (*Lutterworth.*) 80 pp. 2s. 6d.

MOSES.

By Gerhard von Rad. (*Lutterworth.*) 80 pp. 2s. 6d.

Two series of books covering the whole range of the Christian Faith in the modern world, edited by Bishop Stephen Neill and sponsored by the International Missionary Council and important literary bodies in the United States and Canada, are published by the United Society for Christian Literature in this country. Twenty-four have appeared in the first series and eight in the second. The first-named (above) is written by a specialist in the history of the Early Church. Professor E. R. Hardy has been Professor of Church History at Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut, U.S.A., since 1945. His book is number 31 in the second series. We can think of nothing better as a text-book for addresses to young and older people.

The author of the second book, (number 32) is also a Professor, but in the University of Heidelberg. We are told that when he lectures students from many countries crowd into his classroom. In this little book Gerhard von Rad sketches in broad outline the picture of Moses, and then considers the principal features in that revelation of God which is associated with his name. This is a real and well informed appreciation of a great religious leader by one who declares: "What was dimly shown in Moses has been shown to us very much more clearly in Jesus Christ."

A. W. PARSONS.

LETTERS OF CAIAPHAS TO ANNAS.

By James Martin. (*Geoffrey Bles.*) 93 pp. 9s. 6d.

In reading this book one is reminded of *Screwtape Letters* by C. S. Lewis and of *Who moved the stone?* by Frank Morrison. Of *Screwtape*, because this book consists of twenty-three letters purporting to have

been written by Caiaphas to his father-in-law Annas, and of *Who moved the stone?* because the main issue at stake is how can the Empty Tomb be explained. Throughout the correspondence Caiaphas maintains the "Stolen Body" theory, whilst Annas follows the line that Jesus never really died, and revived in the tomb. Caiaphas's chief difficulty is the attitude of the disciples which seems so sincere and authentic and when Saul of Tarsus is converted the letters come to an end with their author clearly beginning to wonder himself whether the disciples may not be right and the impossible to have happened.

Mr. Martin's style is clear and the letters are very readable. They have the great merit of keeping closely to an imaginative use of the Biblical material. There are no surprises, however, and we are not given as deep an insight into the character of Caiaphas as we might expect. The fact that Caiaphas was High Priest for the long period of ten years indicates that he must have been a flexible character with perhaps more imagination than that which is presented here.

This book will not become a classic, but any literature that helps to make the New Testament come alive and makes us realize that the New Testament characters were not stereotyped figures, but men wrestling with issues from which they could not escape, can serve a very useful purpose.

ARTHUR MILROY.

MADAME BLAVATSKY : MEDIUM AND MAGICIAN.

By John Symonds. (Odhams.) 254 pp. 21s.

Has the word "Theosophy" ever puzzled you? Who were the Theosophists anyway? This book provides you with the answer. The Theosophical Society was started in America in 1875 by Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky. "Theosophy" of course means "divine wisdom". They claimed to be rediscovering occult secrets of Ancient Wisdom known to the peoples of Egypt and India. Both Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky were Spiritualists and the Theosophical Society is one of the smaller world Spiritualist societies. They were a strange pair. Colonel Olcott was a New York lawyer prepared to spend his spare time and money on Spiritualist experiments. Madame Blavatsky was a fat Russian woman with penetrating blue eyes who smoked endless cigarettes. She came to the United States in middle life and caused a sensation by her power as a medium.

In 1879 Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky established the new society in India and Ceylon where they made overtures both to Hindus and Buddhists, but only the latter accepted them. To India came inquirers from Europe attracted by Madame Blavatsky's occult powers. The amazing thing about her so-called miracles is their triviality—the discovery in the earth of the cup needed by a picnic party, the reproduction of a family brooch which a hostess wished to see again, the appearance from nowhere of books needed for quotation in Madame Blavatsky's own book *Isis Unveiled*. Apart from healing miracles done by Colonel Olcott in Ceylon by laying on of hands, these phenomena seem to be harnessed to no moral purpose. Neither Colonel Olcott nor Madame Blavatsky have the character of saints, in fact there is much about the character of both of them that does not stand up to the careful investigation the author gives.

This book is extremely entertaining and well written, but there is

nothing in it that would persuade anyone to become a Theosophist. Before reading it one would do well to read the Principal of Tyndale Hall's excellent little pamphlet, *Spiritualism* (published by the Church Book Room Press).

MICHAEL HENNELL.

NOW OR NEVER : THE PROMISE OF THE MIDDLE YEARS.

By Smiley Blanton with Arthur Gordon. (*World's Work*.) 274 pp. 21s.

It has been encouraging to note the fresh approach to Pastoral Psychology in our Church. In addition to the invaluable courses that Dr. Lake is conducting in several dioceses, we have seen a group of clergy meeting in the Gloucester diocese for a fuller understanding of the subject. The U.S.A. has been ahead of us in this, though, as with all good things, there has been a tendency in some places to reduce everything to psychology and omit the theology. Yet a number of good books have come from America, and just a few from this country.

Reuel Howe in *The Creative Years* dealt with some of the problems and opportunities of middle age. Now Dr. Smiley Blanton, who has co-operated so closely with Norman Vincent Peale, has given us, at the age of 76, a popular book that covers the sort of things that we need to know for ourselves, for our relationships with our children, and for understanding others.

Those who have read the deeper books will value this one for its case records. Those who have not previously read much, or who have been allergic to psychology, may well find here some of the insights that they need. Anxiety, marriage, work, money, alcohol, sex, growing old, are tackled sensibly and constructively, but the reader must bear in mind that the author writes, not as a preacher, but as a psychologist who has worked closely with a church congregation. Many of his cases concern the type of people who come to our churches.

I have referred to Dr. Blanton as the author, since there is no indication of who Arthur Gordon is. I hope he is a young disciple.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE THROUGH PRAYER.

By Charles L. Allen. (*World's Work*.) 160 pp. 10s. 6d.

This is a pep book on some aspects of prayer, particularly on the place of prayer in producing peace, with relief from such things as tension, doubts, failures, and sickness. The author shows also the blessings that can come through suffering and through apparently unanswered prayer. So far as it goes, the book is stimulating, and it may be argued that, until the Christian has found adjustment in his own life, he is unlikely to enter upon the deeper responsibilities of prayer. Yet the book tends to be self-centred, and there is virtually nothing about intercessory prayer for others, whether at home or in the mission field.

J. STAFFORD WRIGHT.

GOD'S FRONTIER.

By Martin Descalzo. (*Hutchinson*) 208 pp. 15s.

This book is a translation of the first novel of a young Spanish priest. It tells the story of Renato, a young signalman, who finds himself endowed with miracle-working powers. He raises the broken cross in the village of Torre, he recalls from the dead the ill-treated wife of the

village capitalist, and finally he is stoned to death by assassins hired by the capitalist. The comparison with events in our Lord's life is too close to be accidental. Against this parallel is to be placed the suffering of the village priest, dying of cancer, the disease representing the malignant and increasing evil of the villagers. Their spiritual aridness is also symbolized by the famine, which Renato does not—perhaps cannot—relieve by a miracle. The novel provides a good survey of the villagers—all the different types, and all reacting differently to the stresses they have to face. The sordid profit-making after the village becomes a place of pilgrimage is very strikingly suggested, and its effect on Renato is to produce a final disgusted condemnation, arising from utter despair.

The language is vivid and the sense of atmosphere is always very powerful. Renato himself stands forth, a lonely, perplexed figure, set apart in his sincerity from the others. They in their turn are made to suggest the depth and variety of the life within which the drama of the book is enacted. At times one feels that there are some oversimplifications, and perhaps finally one would suggest that this is a novel of promise rather than performance. But, whatever one says, it is a remarkable first novel.

ARTHUR POLLARD.

MOTHER OF THE MAGNIFICENT : A LIFE OF LUCREZIA TORNA- BUONI.

By Mary Bosanquet. (Faber and Faber.) 191 pp. 16s.

This book, as the authoress says, "is a work of imagination rather than of scholarship." None the less, it is quite evidently based on a wide study of the period—and what period and locality in European history is better calculated to fire the imagination than that of fifteenth century Florence? This story centres round the character of the mother of Lorenzo de' Medici ("Lorenzo the Magnificent"), her childhood, her marriage, her family and friends, and the fortunes of her famous city. It is effectively told, and indeed might with advantage have been developed into a much larger and more detailed work. There are eight half-tone illustrations.

P.E.H.

SOUTH AFRICA : TWO VIEWS OF SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT.

By S. Pienaar and Anthony Sampson. (Oxford University Press.) 81 pp. 5s.

There are two sides to the contemporary South African scene: though the misuse of the pulpit by political parsons and the bias of some press reports might not lead one to think so. The Oxford University Press is to be congratulated for placing side by side two essays giving different viewpoints of the situation, and prepared quite independently of each other. The first, entitled "Safeguarding the Nations of South Africa", is by the foreign correspondent of the Afrikaans newspaper, *Die Burger*, and the second, entitled "Old Fallacies with a New Look: Ignoring the Africans", is by a member of the staff of *The Observer*. They are both well written, marked with sincerity, and deserving of thoughtful study. But it must not be imagined that having read these two essays, one has read all that there is to be said on either side. There is no easy or quick solution to the complex problems with which South Africa is confronted.

P.E.H.